

R E P L Y

T O A N

ANONYMOUS WRITER FROM *BELFAST*,

SIGNED

P O R T I A.

---

BY WILLIAM TODD JONES, Esq.

---

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,  
PORTIA'S ORIGINAL LETTER.

---

D U B L I N:

PUBLISHED BY W. P. CAREY, AT THE NATIONAL EVENING STAR OFFICE,  
NO. 2, EXCHANGE-COURT; AND J. RICE, COLLEGE-GREEN.

AND TO BE HAD OF ALL THE BOOKSELLERS.

1560/589





THE  
E D I T O R  
TO THE  
IRISH CATHOLICS.

---

FELLOW SUFFERERS,

THIS able vindication of the character and principles of our calumniated Ancestors is equally a vindication of the Irish Nation, and of your character and principles at the present day. The interested prejudice which so lately conjured up the ghost of Protestant Ascendancy to counteract the progress of liberality and public Spirit had its origin in remote periods of national disaster and disgrace. That CORPORATION SELFISHNESS which grasps at a monopoly of mutilated freedom, and petitions for a continuance of Catholic Slavery was equally zealous for centuries back in the seizure of Irish inheritance. The change of times, and the unshaken perseverance of Catholic Loyalty leave no handle *now* for involving whole families and counties in indiscriminate proscription and forfeiture, but the spirit which would preclude you from your right to the  
a. elective

elective franchise, is nearly a-kin to that which guided the tyrannical rapacity of a STRAFFORD or the sanguinary executions of a Cromwell: incapable of producing the same ruinous effects, it is the same in its principle of excluding you from the benefits of the constitution.

In the dark and melancholy pages of our History penned by enemies, the barbarities which the unhappy Irish suffered could not be forgotten, nor are they attempted to be wholly concealed. Elevated by the possession of Power above the reach of Justice, our enemies seem to have lost with the dread of punishment, every sense of shame: their writers have not scrupled, at times, to enter into a detail of their enormities, scarcely taking the trouble to veil them under the thinnest disguise. Unable to deny the unbridled ravages of military ferocity, they applaud them as a display of loyalty in their Soldiery, and a due exertion of the regal authority. They sanction the unjustifiable seizure of rightful possessions by the name of merited forfeiture, and colour over innumerable instances of legal murder as so many necessary sacrifices to the security of the



the *English* government. We are not to be surprised if the same vindictive pens as grossly misrepresent the motives and actions of the unhappy sufferers, whose honourable but fruitless resistance they have branded with the odium of Popish rebellion and treacherous massacre.

Among the most inveterate of our libellers ARCHBISHOP KING was eminently conspicuous; his work has been the text book of catholic condemnation from which our enemies have quoted ever since his time. Stigmatized for imputed crimes, and degraded by penal statutes, we were necessitated to submit, while the most unfounded and absurd charges were made a pretext for our oppressions. So hardly were we treated that our vindications were rejected without examination, our silent acquiescence failed to produce redress, and our humble petitions were assigned as most forcible reasons for continuing the infamous code of restriction of which we complained.

In this disgraceful and affecting display of Protestant intolerance and Catholic humiliation, it required a more than common  
 exertion

exertion to serve us. The luke-warm zeal of many discerning public characters stood neutral, fearful of embarking in our cause. Numbers swayed by partial and interested motives sacrificed their conviction in our favour, to fears of party and ministerial indignation. The laws were armed with scourges against us, and Religion forgetting its sacred function, lent it's voice to sanction our oppressions. In so trying a crisis we beheld a member of the senate, the enlightened writer of the following sheets, step forward in our behalf. Warmed by a generous zeal, respectable by birth, by talents, by situation, he became our friend, our vindicator. In the heart of a presbyterian province, surrounded by prejudices, against the sense of the most popular Nobleman in the Kingdom, at a time when the religious liberality of Ireland was yet a feeble infant in the cradle, the manly, the liberal, the philosophic JONES recognised the fallen, persecuted Catholic as his brother, he compassionated his misfortunes, and boldly asserting our right of suffrage, put the *little Patriots of the day* to the blush, while he called on the *affected friends of reform* to prove their *sincerity* by adopting three millions of their alienated countrymen as the  
lawful



lawful children of that constitution whose weakness they avowed, and professed to repair.

The zeal of a less firm and comprehensive mind would have cooled by opposition, by fears of incurring enmity, or it would have languished through length of time, a despair of success, and a thousand other difficulties, but the ardour of this *Protestant Precursor* of *Catholic* emancipation far from being enfeebled by these causes, caught new energy from a conviction that the more formidable our enemies, the more vigorous should be the efforts of our friends —

If we proportion our gratitude to the determined opposition which he had to encounter from the powerful combination of interest and prejudice, we owe to the abilities of our patriotic friend a debt which we can never fully repay. Armed as a *volunteer* with the invincible weapons of truth, he attacked falsehood in her intrenchments: he carried the sword into the camp of our enemies, he turned their batteries on themselves, and the banner inwoven with the story of our imputed crimes, reared by the hands of the *intolerant Archbishop*, is now torn down,

no

no more to wave in triumph over the bleeding reputation of our Ancestors, or to wound *our* feelings with the cruel aggravation of unmerited calumny and insult.

I *feel*, my friends, but cannot *express*, what is due from us to a character so exalted, to a friendship so disinterested. How pure, how noble is that Patriotism in which every *selfish* thought is extinguished in considerations for the *general good*. How highly should we prize that generous fervour which exchanges the sweets of retirement, for the warfare of party; the pleasures of animated society for the severity of literary application, and unpleasant researches into the sanguinary chaos of our antient records. In every page of this work, you will be struck with the ardour of a benevolent spirit seeking to draw forth truth from the obscurity of intolerant calumny, combatting against rooted prejudices, and labouring for the political salvation of *every* class of Irishmen. At a time when *Protestant Liberty* is loud in approbation of his patriotic exertions, shall *we*, in whose cause he has so zealously engaged, be *silent*? No—my friends, let us prove by our *gratitude*



*tude* to our steady vindicator, that we possess virtues *worthy* of being *free*, though *hitherto* robbed of the blessings of freedom.

I shall feel it as one of the most pleasing recollections of my life that these incontrovertible arguments in favour of our emancipation, first made their appearance in the National Evening Star \*.

Having from the first publication of that paper devoted it to the dissemination of free principles, and to the support of the Catholic cause, I consider it the most honourable proof of approbation that our enlightened and patriotic protestant friend has distinguished the STAR by making it the vehicle for conveying to the nation his invaluable researches.

Convinced that the invariable tenour of your loyal and peaceable conduct must ultimately obtain you a restoration to the blessings of the constitution, I congratulate you on the spirit of union which now so happily harmonises the Catholics of Ireland into one interest, a circumstance which *only*  
With

\* The Rights of Irishmen, or National Evening Star.

[ viii ]

is wanting to give dignity to your petitions  
and to procure an ample redress of your  
grievances.

With the most zealous wishes for a speedy  
and prosperous issue to your labours,

I have the honour to be,

Your most sincere and devoted servant,

W. P. CAREY.

NATIONAL STAR OFFICE,

No. 2, *Exchange-Court*,

May 5, 1792.



---

## L E T T E R S, &c.

---

*On Thursday, February 21st, 1792, this Anonymous Letter was published in Mr. Joy's Belfast News Letter; in consequence of Mr. Jones's Letter addressed to the Belfast Societies a week before. — To which Mr. Jones gave the following reply, in parts, as they appeared periodically in the National Evening Star.*

---

FOR THE BELFAST NEWS-LETTER.  
TO MR. JOY.

SIR,

AS your paper has long been remarkable for chastity in selection, for contempt of private calumny, and for a fair review of arguments as well as facts, suffer me to use it as the vehicle of the following remarks.

Mr. Todd Jones has followed the example of his precursors in the same cause, by blazoning the public spirit of the Catholic Parliament, summoned in Ireland, by King James. I shall grant most willingly  
B that

that several of its acts were highly patriotic, and dictated by the interest of the country — but there was *one* of so dark a complexion, that to pass it without notice, argues in Mr. Jones a want of that candour without which the historian merits little regard. The present is an age of research into times that are past; and as this year is likely to teem with such disquisitions, I shall beg leave to ask that gentleman the following question — Why is the attempt of that parliament to procure “a Bill of Rights, a Repeal of the Law of Poynings, an Assertion of the Independence of the Irish Legislature, and a Navigation Act,” to be trumpeted forth — whilst its mean, clandestine, and wicked *proscription* and (intended) *confiscation* of the persons and estates of the Protestants of this country, are to be as cautiously concealed from the public eye at present, as the act itself was by the Assembly that passed it?

A proscription of *two thousand four hundred and sixty-one* Protestants, concealed intentionally from those who were to be ruined by it, till the term limited for pardon should be passed — deserves an epithet worse than any I shall apply.

The curious reader may find that *patriotic* act, and the name of every person so proscribed, arranged in their respective counties, by referring to Archbishop King’s State of the Protestants under King James’s Government, p. 199, to 244.

Far am I from charging the crime of that age on their successors—but I shall never hear the bombastic praises of that Parliament, without damning its fame, by reviving a recollection of the worst law which a bad legislature could enact. I decline to give the words of the act, as it is a disgraceful blot in human annals; confining myself at present to Dr. Leland’s brief remarks on that transaction.

Let this gentle check teach the Pamphleteers of the day to rest on the pillars of historical record; to let  
truth,



*truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth* hold their pen—lest the detection of concealed facts blast the cause which they are so anxious to defend.

Having thus thrown down the gauntlet to a Knight versed in the laws of chivalry and romance, I am persuaded his gallantry won't suffer the inaccuracies of *female* composition to prevent his entering the lists with his obedient servant,

BELFAST,

PORTIA.

February 15, 1792.

## EXTRACT

FROM DR. LELAND'S HISTORY OF IRELAND.

REIGN OF JAMES II. — PAGE 139.

“ But this Irish Parliament was not contented with  
 “ recovering the estates of their ancestors, and ex-  
 “ pelling the Protestant proprietors, by virtue of their  
 “ present act. In the fulness of triumphant inso-  
 “ lence, they resolved on a proscription as virulent  
 “ as that of Rome. An act was passed by which a  
 “ number of persons in the service of the Prince of  
 “ Orange, those who had retired from the kingdom,  
 “ and did not return in obedience to the King's pro-  
 “ clamations, numbers who were resident in Britain,  
 “ and therefore presumed to be adherents to the new  
 “ government, were all attainted of high treason,  
 “ and adjudged to suffer *the pains of death and for-  
 “ feiture, unless they surrendered within certain periods  
 “ assigned*. It was provided, that the estates even of  
 “ those who were detained abroad by sickness, or  
 “ non-age, should be seized by the King; and, in  
 “ defiance of justice and humanity, they were to  
 “ prove their own innocence before they could be  
 “ restored.

“ Two

“ *Two thousand four hundred and sixty-one* persons,  
 “ of all orders and conditions, Peers, Peereffes,  
 “ Prelates, Baronets, Knights, Clergy, Gentry, and  
 “ Yeomanry, were included in this dreadful sen-  
 “ tence.

“ Their names were hastily collected by their re-  
 “ spective neighbours, and received with so much  
 “ ease and precipitation, that Nagle, on presenting  
 “ the bill to James, declared, ‘ that many were at-  
 “ tainted on such evidence as satisfied the house, and  
 “ the rest, on common fame.’ It was so framed as  
 “ to preclude the King from all power of pardoning,  
 “ after the first day of November, 1689.—In the  
 “ mean time, a statute which affected the lives and  
 “ properties of so many thousands, was carefully  
 “ *concealed from them*, and lay unknown in the cus-  
 “ tody of the Chancellor.—At length, when four  
 “ months had elapsed from the day limited for par-  
 “ doning, Sir THOMAS SOUTHWELL obtained a  
 “ view of this fatal act, for the instruction of his  
 “ lawyer, who was to draw a warrant for his pardon,  
 “ which James had promised. Nagle was surprised  
 “ and enraged at this discovery: —after some eva-  
 “ sions, he insisted, that the King was merely a  
 “ trustee for the forfeitures, and had now no power  
 “ of pardoning Southwell.

“ Nothing remained for James but to reproach  
 “ his Attorney-General for having framed an act in-  
 “ trenching on his prerogative.”



TO MR. W. P. CAREY, Printer of the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T I.

Dublin, March 14, 1792.

S I R,

I Have been much impeded in giving the following reply, by the difficulty of procuring all Archbishop King's books, and Doctor Leslie's Confutation of the one quoted by Portia: and the subject was too important to hazard a light discussion; this will therefore account for the delay in sending you the inclosed; which I beg to trouble you with inserting, at a convenient time.

WILLIAM TODD JONES.

To P O R T I A.

MADAM,

I have perused your ladyship's letter addressed to me in Mr. Joy's newspaper of the 21st February, and reprinted at your desire in Mr. Faulkner's paper the following week: but the necessary attention to the trial of my *petition*, which was then pending, rendered it very inconvenient to turn to requisite authorities, authorities in themselves very scarce, and difficult to be procured, so as sooner to afford your epistle the refutation it demanded.

But, madam, little accustomed as I have been to the attention of learned ladies, I am doubtful of my happiness in the present address; and rather apprehend a BRUTUS, under the signature of his *wife*—It is certainly honourable to combat beneath the banners of beauty, but this is fighting under her very petticoats. Achilles was detected by choosing his armour; and here, a *professional* preference may have directed to the exploded labours of archbishop King, and if right I read, the apron-string is tied upon the cassock.

But,

But, however matters may have been thus reversed from their usual order, and that in this instance the furbelow has risen upon the GOWN, I shall make no colouring of cavil at so whimsical a mode of encounter, and will only hazard a fervent hope that it was a *protestant ascendancy*.

One consideration alone affords consolation to my despairing vanity, respecting your ladyship's doubtful gender, which is, that I can scarcely imagine any respectable character will *anonymously* attack, or censure another who comes candidly forward with his name, unless the delicacy of *sex* prohibited the signature: more especially upon a subject in which prejudice and passion unite themselves against argument and history, and where dislike and odium may be expected to attend the unbiassed enquirer after truth; and the fearless publisher of his discoveries.

Upon the topic of my last pamphlet, therefore, REAL NAMES are essentially necessary to render the weapons of the combatants of an equal length. I therefore, once for all declare that I will not, beyond this publication, reply to any attack upon my principles or my argument, which is not sanctioned by the name of the assailant: because nothing short of that *can be an honourable procedure personally to me*—It is very troublesome to continue writing, as I do, producing my historical authorities for almost every line: it would be endless to undertake the confutation of every unknown assailant, who may screen any *impertinence* [this is totally unapplied to my present correspondent] behind his masquerade habit; and it is very unsatisfactory to fight in the dark.

Now to the point. Doctor Leland was a useful compiler, and I respect his memory; indeed I have testified as much by my frequent quotations? but he was an ecclesiastical, high-church authority: he neither loved the catholics, nor could endure the protestant



testant dissenters: his learning, therefore, is evidently against both: and I peruse him with caution when he treats of either: but for this very reason I accurately perused him; because where his text is favourable to the catholics, they must have been innocent indeed.—And, therefore, his authority in testimony of that innocence would be incontrovertible. For the same reason, were I to use my feeble but impartial pen, [having myself not one drop of presbyterian blood in my veins,] in combating any oppression operating against that most enlightened of the christian sects, the protestant dissenters, I should sedulously consult Leland, Cox and Campion; because these three authorities were bigotted against them: but thank God, THEY require not vindication: and armed with numbers and with power, they smile contempt upon the most saucy and most aristocratic of their calumniators; for oppressors they have none; no little despot dare wag his finger against THEM: tho' with the ancient lion, in the fable, every ass, and timid animal of the hour, can plant his heel upon the PROSTRATE CATHOLICS!—I thank God! my countrymen of one province *are* partakers of the constitution; have clothed their province with industry and riches, *the never-failing harvest of liberty*: and now bid defiance to the canker of despotism—and I heartily join in *their general wish*, notwithstanding Brutus in petticoats, or any other petticoated Pope Joan, with or without a tiara, that the long-injured catholic was in a similar situation, and as little required advocates in his devoted cause.

The fact is, I believe no such statute as that adduced by Portia, EVER HAD AN EXISTENCE, because it is no where to be found; where is it? It is not in *my* collection of all the statutes of James 2d's session of parliament, 1689, nor in any of the few collections, now existing in Dublin, and to which I have had access for three weeks past. Though my collection includes his majesty's speech opening the session,

cession, and also the bill for prohibiting the importation of British coals into Ireland, and the obnoxious bill for regulating tithe: and it is a real original of one of those collections which were printed at the day; and afterwards ordered by King William's parliament to be destroyed in the castle chamber, under penalty of 500l. See the iron bed of the tyrant, under which the unfortunate catholic is reduced to his trial: if he is too short, he is stretched to its length: if he be too tall, he is amputated to its dimensions. A blasted old woman in shape of an archbishop, forges a calumny upon a prostrate enemy, ground to powder by defeat and oppression: a protestant government foment, and favours the LIE; orders every formal and attested copy of king James's statutes, under heavy penalties, to be brought in, to be cancelled, and utterly destroyed; AND THEN, like a tall bully, lifts its head and audaciously pronounces, that such, and such, and such wicked statutes were among them, after having previously taken away every evidence the calumniated catholic could have adduced of what WAS NOT done, by cancelling with flames and penalties, *every evidence* of WHAT WAS done, by that illustrious body of extraordinary men, whom chance had thrown together in the parliament of an unfortunate sovereign.

But an evidence *does* remain, it is in my hand, and it contains no such statute! Hume, Smollet, and Leland contain no recitation of such a statute, all, all their assertions are upon the authority of King.

But the fact [as stated by King] is impossible: conceive the absurdity; an act of parliament is *smuggled*, where! through two houses of lords and commons; of whom were they composed? of catholics crowded with protestants; though Leland, upon the authority of King, says there were but fourteen *real* protestants. Well, granted 14 (though it is doubted whether there was not a *majority* of protestants in



in the upper house) well, what did these two houses do? They voted and passed a *secret* act of attainder of 2,500 protestants, which was to lie-by privately in peito, to be brought forward *at a proper time*; unknown, unheard of, by all the protestant part of the kingdom, till *peace* was restored: and that, according to King, was to be deemed *the proper time* for a renewal of *war* and *devastation*, by its publication, and execution, and the secret was to be closely kept from nearly 3000 persons, by the whole house of commons; by fifty-six peers, including primate Boyle, Barry lord Barrymore, Angier lord Longford, Forbes, the incomparable lord Granard, (of whom more in my next continuation) Parsons lord Ross, Dopping, b. p. of Meath, Otway, b. p. of Ossory, Weterhal, bishop of Cork, Digby, bishop of Limerick, Bermingham lord Athenry, St. Lawrence lord Howth, Malon lord Glenmallon, Hamilton lord Strabane, all protestants and many of them presbyterians, or rather puritans. It was to be kept close from 3000 persons by all the privy council; by all the clerks of parliament who engross, and tack together bills, it was to be kept an entire secret from all the protestants without doors, by all the protestants within the gates of parliament; and this probable, wise, politic expectation was entertained *by those catholic peers and representatives* who through the cloud of war, passion, and uncertainty, could exercise the more than human moderation in solemnly prescribing the narrow bounds of thirty-eight years to all enquirers after titles under the revived court of claims: by those peers and representatives, whose patriotism, political knowledge, and comprehensive minds instructed them TO DECLARE THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REALM, the FREEDOM OF IRISH TRADE, AND THE INESTIMABLE VALUE OF A MARINE.—Good God, that any man, woman I mean; after such ACKNOWLEDGED, UNCONTROVERTED DOCUMENTS of the wisdom, and reach

C of

of mind of that parliament, could be induced to credit, and to advance the forgeries of a vicar of Bray under a persecuting, protestant administration, FOR THE WICKED PURPOSE OF CALUMNIATING THEIR MEMORY, AND DEFEATING THE EFFORTS OF THEIR POSTERITY FOR FREEDOM. To credit, and to advance the forgeries, or the dreams of those gossipping old women Goody King or Goody Story, who assert the apparitions at Portadown bridge, and the screeches of murdered Protestants for a fortnight together, in the black water; and the glorious and amazing sights, and “the ugly black thing” and the consequent madness of one John Keating, for pulling down an old pulpit cloth in the church of Trim, (King, p. 336.)

Oh, my dear Portia, if neither old nor crooked thou beest a female without a beard, thou mightest be instructed in amusements far more interesting, and art mistress of arguments far more convincing, than thus brandishing pen in hand, and thus furiously mounting upon a crazy archbishop, mistaking him for a broom-stick, and riding him like a witch.

211

29

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

## P A R T II.

*I* Believe this asserted bill of attainder never had any existence AS A STATUTE: I believe the proscribed names were in a schedule of that violent man who had no influence with the house of commons, Sir Richard Nangle the Attorney General, and that it never passed into an act of parliament: and my reason is, *that no such statute is any where to be found*, but in Doctor King's book—and where did the doctor discover it? — he does not inform us—but he annexes to the end of it “a true copy” — and adds the name of “Richard Darling, clerk in the office of



of the Master of the Rolls"—(King's Protestants, p. 244) — now how came it to be preserved there? for there was an express act of parliament ordering the whole body of statutes passed by James's parliament to be brought into the council chamber and utterly cancelled and destroyed, under a very heavy pecuniary penalty, and *incapacitation of all places of trust under the crown*: and it would, therefore, be very extraordinary if the master of the rolls should be among the number of those who violated that statute, and should risk the forfeiture of his place—and accordingly, *no such roll or statute is now to be discovered in the rolls office*, amid multitudes of instruments of much older existence.

*It is possible* an outline of some such bill might have been prepared by one of those hot-headed people of whom James had too many in his councils, either for his safety, or his reputation, and they were chiefly ENGLISH; and that such draft of a bill having been laid before *parliament*, that wise, patriotic, and sagacious *body* did meliorate and reduce it into "the statute for the revival of the court of claims;" a law so unparalleled from its moderation in its review of forfeitures, by going back to *Cromwell's debentures exclusively*; a period of only thirty-eight years anterior to the date of their then sitting.

Such a *draft of a bill*, like our own protestant bill for the castration of Romish priests, *which did pass* here, but was cushioned in England, or like the *threat of a bill for levelling popish chapels* which I myself heard made, when I sat in the house of commons, such a draft of a bill, I say, might have been found among the baggage of the Duke of Tyrconnel, of Sir Richard Nangle, or of the unfortunate sovereign, himself—for Burnet acquaints us "That all Tyrconnel's papers were taken in the camp; and those of James were found in Dublin." (Burnet's own times—vol. 2d. p. 30).

But

But from Doctor King's own relation (page 131) the validity of such a bill of proscription existing, originated with, and rested upon the veracity of one individual only, one Sir Thomas Southwell, a babe of the covenant, who having committed some crime amounting to treason, in, or before 1688, for which he could not obtain pardon, trumped up this calumny in collusion perhaps with King (at this time king James's bosom counsellor, as I am coming to, presently) to create favor and forgiveness with the rising Dutch and English interest: in which, however, it appears he was disappointed, for he never was pardoned, but died an exile in Scotland, a dependent upon my Lord Seaforth, another covenantor—(Peerage, vol. 3. p. 40.)

This proscribing statute, however, was not accidentally preserved, and found among the pillage of king James, and his vanquished ministers; no, Doctor King maintains the real statute was in the Rolls Office, and authenticated to him by “copia vera” and “Richard Darling, cleric. in offic. mri rot.”

Now how it came to be there is difficult to imagine: for there is no precedent of lodgments of acts of parliament ever having been made in the custody of the Master of the Rolls; his office having been, I believe, always exclusively appropriated to the deposits of patents, and all pleadings and decrees in Chancery, and the other courts: and how this statute came *to be no longer there* after serving the purpose of Doctor King's quotations, is still harder to account for---Leland never saw the statute---he quotes King,---Sir James Dalrymple never saw the statute—he quotes King—(Memoirs of G. Britain and Ireland in 1689, vol. 2d. Strahan's Lond. edit.) Dr. Burnet gives it a slight mention, but he *thinks proper* to quote nobody. (Vol. 2d. fol. page 39.)

Yet it is undoubtedly certain that all this while, no such statute is any where to be found among the  
remaining



remaining copies of the compilation of statutes of 1689, though all these compilations, and they are very few, *exactly tally in the number, and in the order of the statutes* which they contain.

I will now proceed to a more entertaining discussion, the living reputation, the literary veracity, and the political integrity of Dr. King—the high-flying, the creeping, the passive-obedient, the resisting, the marvelous, the spectre-relating, the *accommodating* Doctor King—to investigate how far he was, or was not capable of such a *forgery*, for a pious cause; or at least of a most enlarged, and comprehensive embellishment—Waller had the honor and the good fortune successively to exercise his poetic vein in addressing two rivals for empire: and how much is it to be deplored that the reasention of James to his hereditary throne should not have extorted from the archbishop *another volume, in far different strain*; and have enriched the repositories of the lazy-learned with *two* such literary gems.

Hear Dr. Leslie's arraignment of his quondam clerical companion.—Now Doctor Leslie was a learned protestant divine; and HE, also, had a comfortable detestation of the catholics; whom he calumniates through the tenor of his whole book; and almost entirely *upon the ground of their* ERECTING A CONSTITUTION INDEPENDENT OF ENGLAND, AND EXTORTING FROM KING JAMES A RATIFICATION OF THEIR LIBERTIES. For such is the fatality of the catholic cause!—Defenders they have none upon the shelves of the learned; *penalty and persecution arrested the pen*—and we are reduced to rescue the reputation of *departed greatness*, even FROM THE EVIDENCE of the saucy pages of its triumphant oppressors.

“ Doctor Leslie published his strictures upon the books of Archbishop King, not only during his grace's life-time, but his grace survived the publication near thirty years.”—[Curry's Civil Wars, vol. 2.

p. 146.]

p. 146.] Which strictures never were answered by King, or any other man; but *Leslie's book* was by the influence of the archbishop SUPPRESSED BY AUTHORITY in the first edition: — Such was King's mode of discovering truth! [Curry, vol. 2. p. 142.] And such is the authority which Portia can produce to stigmatize a parliament, who declared the independent constitution of the island, and who opened her commerce to all the oceans of the world!

Doctor Leslie's answer to King was suppressed by authority. He was a non-juror, and refused to take the oaths to King William; with respect to his moral character. "Without doubt," says Dean Swift, "Mr. Leslie is unhappily misled in his politics; but he has given the world such proofs of his soundness in religion, as many a bishop ought to be proud of. — I verily believe, that he acted from a mistaken conscience in refusing to swear allegiance to King William, and I therefore distinguish between the principles, and the man. — I know he is the son of a great and excellent prelate —" [Swift's Works, vol. 6. p. 118.] With regard to the book itself Swift appears to have stimulated King to a reply, but without effect.

"No man," says Doctor Leslie, "Was, or could be, an higher assertor of passive obedience than Doctor King had been all his life time." — Even at the beginning of the revolution, he told a person of honor, from whose mouth I had it, "that if the prince of Orange came over for the crown, he prayed God might blast his designs." — In a letter to a person of undoubted credit, in the year 1686, he said, "The principle of *non-resistance* is a steady principle of *loyalty*; that it was intolerable for the members of any state to flee to *foreign* succours, on pretence that their own governors had made laws against reason and conscience."

"That it would be a glorious fight to see a cart full of clergymen going to the stake for passive obedience



dience—that there was no way to preserve the honor of our religion, but by adhering unalterably to our *loyalty*.”

“ At a meeting of the clergy in Dublin, in the beginning of 1688, to consider what measures they were to take,” he declared, “ *That their taking arms in the North of Ireland, at that time, was RANK REBELLION, if there could be any rebellion ; particularly Derry shutting their gates against the king’s forces sent thither.*” And in the year 1687, he wrote a letter from Wexford waters, where he went for health, to a person of undoubted credit, giving an account of his journey, and of the substance of discourses which he had with the bishops of Waterford, Corke, and Cloyne, in which he says, “ That among other things he advised them to a steadiness *in their loyalty*, and that he had asserted—that if the king and his governors, *should enact unjust laws*, that the subject had no remedy *bnt patience* ; for against him are allowed no other weapons—but *prayers and tears.*” —Leslie then adds, “ What is above written, I have from the person to whom Doctor King wrote it ; and more to the same purpose ; and IF HE DESIRES IT, his letter shall be produced.” —[Doctor Leslie’s reply to Doctor King, Lond. Edit. 1692, p. 113, 114, 115.]

But his grace *never did desire it* ; though he survived Leslie thirty years—but he chose as the shorter method *to suppress Leslie’s book*, BY AUTHORITY, and thus to smother ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS, boldly made by a protestant divine, which he did not dare openly to face.

So much for to-day ; and such is the *respectable* authority quoted by my Belfast correspondent, unsupported by any other warrants—BUT SUCH AUTHORITIES AND SUCH NARRATORS, are best calculated for the libraries of bigotry ; they feed our prejudices, and minister to our appetites for political, and spiritual subjugation.

For

## P A R T III.

BY SUCH SOLEMN ASSURANCES OF LOYALTY did Doctor King entirely impose upon James II.; inso-much, that according to Doctor Leslie, "KING JAMES had so excellent an opinion of him, that his majesty had him frequently in his closet, and trusted him in his most private affairs, until at last he discovered that he was holding correspondence with his enemies; and he was thereupon imprisoned: but his old friend, Chief Justice Herbert, was so far mistaken in him, that he vouched for him at the council board with so much zeal as to say, *that he was as loyal a man to King James as any that sat at that board*; which did retrieve the doctor from some inconveniences, and continued him in King James's good opinion.—Doctor King owes it to KING JAMES'S MERCY, that he now lives to thank him for his goodness. Was he not accused of giving intelligence to the rebels, as they were then called, both in England, and in the North of Ireland?—And was it not true?—Did he not give frequent intelligence to Duke Schomberg by one Harman, and keep up a constant correspondence with Mr. Tollet, and others in London?—He knows this would have been called *treason* in those days, and a *bloody-minded tyrant* [his epithet for his old master] would have found another remedy for it *than a short imprisonment*.—Before the depositions concerning the suspected birth of the Prince of Wales were published, *Doctor King wrote a letter in SEPTEMBER 1688*, mightily bemoaning that so little care was taken to make proof of the Prince's birth, to stop the stories which were spreading about it.—"If," says his letter, "any thing of this were done, *I am confident the church of England would once more, as in the bill of exclusion, venture to oppose the current of the nation, and stand by the truth*." Yet Doctor King, ON THE 16th NOVEMBER, 1690, only  
two



two years after, in the thanksgiving sermon which he preached for the victory of the battle of the Boyne, says, page 16, speaking of the Prince of Wales's birth, "*that it was not so much as a well contrived cheat: for we are satisfied that this popish contrivance was the only womb that conceived a prince for us, and gave him a birth.*" Yet the doctor had advanced, to a gentleman, even after the battle of the Boyne, "that the parliament in England had neither proved the imposture of the Prince of Wales's birth; nor the French league, with which the nation had been so much alarmed: and that it was *imposing upon the nation to think to make them swallow these things.*" In confirmation of which sentiments, the doctor, and the Dublin established clergy, prayed daily for this *ill-contrived cheat*, as Prince of Wales; and also for his father *that God would give him victory over all his enemies.* When that was the thing he confesses in his book, he least wished, and laboured all he could against it"—[Leslie's Reply, page 105, 6, 7, 8.]

THESE CHARGES, PORTIA, were openly made, boldly asserted, and PASSIVELY SUBMITTED TO.—Poor Leslie was deprived; his book was put down by AUTHORITY; and Archbishop King survived its publication, IN SILENT SHAME, for more than thirty years!—*Facts*, which are, *in themselves*, refutations of the literary credit of any man—and accordingly, Doctor Leslie finds himself constrained to say, "I cannot assert, that I have examined into every single fact which Doctor King related: I could not have the opportunity; but I am sure I have looked into the most material, and by these I will judge of his integrity in the rest. But this I can say, that there is not one I have enquired into, but I have found it FALSE in the whole, or in part aggravated, or misrepresented—so as to alter the whole face of the story, and give it perfectly another air and turn—inasmuch, that though many things he says are true; yet he has

D

hardly

*hardly spoken a true word* — that is, told it truly and nakedly, without a warp — and this I shall say, that *where this author seems most exact, and sets his quotations as you would think verbatim in the margin, that you might suspect nothing, THERE YOU ARE CHIEFLY TO SUSPECT, AND YOU MUST STAND UPON YOUR GUARD.*” — [Leslie’s Reply, p. 175.]

THESE INTOLERABLE CHARGES, PORTIA, to be basely submitted to by a man of honour, much less a primate, and notoriously adduced against him by a *brother divine*, by a gentleman his superior in birth, his equal in learning, and beyond his cotemporaries in reputed integrity, innocent manners, and self-approving conscience, *was totally unreplied to, in the long space of thirty years*: though after Leslie’s book had been, by the influence of the archbishop, suppressed by authority in Ireland, it was reprinted at London, and was *universally circulated*, in 1692. — [Doctor Curry, vol. 2d.] Am I not sanctioned, therefore, Portia, in some degree, in DOUBTING *that Doctor King found the statute of attainder in the Rolls Office; or in any office*; as the whole authority for such a statute rests upon him — or, according to the accusation, and the caution of Doctor Leslie, “*should I not chiefly suspect and stand most upon my guard, where Doctor King seems MOST EXACT, and sets his QUOTATIONS in the margin, THAT YOU MAY SUSPECT NOTHING*” — more especially as no such statute is among any of the collections; or is any where to be found; *unless Portia can produce it.*

As one favourite topic of Doctor King’s reproaches (after his conversion to RESISTANCE had come upon him in the shape of an archbishoprick) was the bigotry, and non-resistance of the catholick clergy, let us review his reverence’s own *pendulum-like demeanour*, in his vibrations of loyalty between the old king, and the new prince; *his conscience still suspend-*  
ing



*ing from the machinery of the castle ; and here his sacerdotal doublings will appear infinitely comical.*

DOCTOR KING THOUGHT PROPER TO PREACH NON-RESISTANCE during the reigns of Charles and of the infatuated James : and accordingly “ he and the rest of the established clergy of Dublin, prayed to Almighty God for the Prince of Wales, and for his father James 2d, that God would give him victory over all his enemies—*thus at the time of the association of the protestants in the North in September 1688,* doctor King, and the Dublin established clergy *prayed for king James*—at the beginning of March 1689, doctor King thought proper to proclaim the Prince of Orange, king, and he, and the clergy prayed for HIM, and that God would give HIM victory over all his enemies—on the 14th of March following, happened the victory of James’s army in the county of Down under colonel O’Neill, known by us Northerners, as the *break of Dromore*, which reduced all our country to James’s forces, but Derry, and Enniskillen—then doctor King, and the clergy PRAYED AGAIN *for king James and the Prince of Wales*—in the August following the duke of Schomberg landed with an English army, then as far as the duke’s quarters reached, doctor King, and the clergy RETURNED TO PRAY *for the Prince of Orange, that God would destroy all his enemies ;* but the rest of the established clergy, *who were without the duke’s lines,* STILL CONTINUED TO PRAY “ for king James and his son.”—Yet, Leslie continues, doctor King now tells us that all this while, *he and they meant the same thing :* FOUR TIMES IN ONE YEAR praying forward and backward, point blank contradictory to one another—(Leslie—page 108, 109.)

But, Leslie continues, “ nothing of all this touches, or affects doctor King”—he is still very confident that he was not guilty “ *of any servile or mean compliances*”—(King—p. 238) or, as the bishop of Meath expresses

expresses it in his address at the head of the clergy to king William, “ of no compliances *but such as were at once both innocent and necessary* ”—(address of the clergy of the church of Ireland to King William 1690 page 76—appendix to Leslie.)

The comment of the *conscientious* and *unworthily used* Leslie upon these counter petitions to Almighty God, is severe enough — “ If, says he, to deceive men was neither *servile* nor *mean*, was it both *innocent* and *necessary* thus to mock God! — Did it not give ground for the charge with which doctor King says the papists loaded them, “ THAT THEY HAD NO RELIGION AT ALL. ”—(Leslie—page 110).

Will Portia excuse me for adding MY comment also upon these extracts from the *good* and *innocent* doctor Leslie?—and with it, close *his impeachment* of Portia’s authority, the COURTLY and ACCOMMODATING archbishop King.

Were the injured catholics of 1792 to teach themselves *such casuistry*, and to practice up to *such accommodating doctrines*, they need not labour under the manifold disqualifications they now endure: nor would they now need to beg for favors from the proudest head amongst the *protestant ascendancy*—BUT THEIR REGARD TO THEIR RELIGION, AND TO THE SACREDNESS OF OATHS, balanced against the temptations of profit, and authority, FOREGOING THESE when to be only obtained by the violation of the former, peculiarly stamps them as the MOST CONSCIENTIOUS OF MANKIND! exhibiting a standard of NATIONAL INTEGRITY I am bold to assert unparalleled in the governments of the world.—The MANY peacefully relinquishing dominion to the FEW, rather than trifle with religion and equivocate with oaths, which would communicate to them a participation of every department of the state!

If my obliging printer and the public will be troubled with me, I mean to continue my animadversions upon



upon doctor King, and his coadjutors; and upon some of the *transactions themselves* of the administration of King William; to beat down finally the calumnies of the party writers of *that period*; and TO VICIATE THE HISTORICAL AUTHORITIES which the protestant bigots of the *present age* adduce from the protestant tyrants of the *last*.

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T IV.

A Secret conspiracy BY WAY OF STATUTE against the lives of near three thousand people, appears in itself impracticable, and fabulous; but that it should have been agitated IN OPEN PARLIAMENT, and in the hearing of the protestant members, and yet expected to have been kept a secret from the protestants, *by these protestant members*, is childish, and ridiculous—In that parliament sat the venerable lord Granard, a protestant, and *a constant adherent, and companion* of king James in Ireland—“This excellent nobleman had married a lady of presbyterian principles; was the protector of the northern puritans; had humanely secreted their teachers from those severities which in England proved both odious and impolitic; and had gained them an annual pension of 500l. from government” (Leland vol. 3. p. 490)—“It was this lord Granard to whom the assembled protestants of Ulster, by colonel Hamilton of Tullymore, who was sent to Dublin for the sole purpose, unanimously offered the command of their armed association, from their confidence in his protestant principles: but he told Mr. Hamilton” THAT HE HAD LIVED LOYAL ALL HIS LIFE, AND WOULD NOT DEPART FROM IT IN HIS OLD AGE; AND HE WAS RESOLVED THAT NO MAN SHOULD WRITE REBEL

BEL UPON HIS GRAVESTONE"—And then the association chose lord Mount Alexander.—This was the 6th of December 1688, before king James had left England — (Leslie's reply—p. 79, 80)—It was this venerable nobleman who advised the king upon the steps of the Cloysters, where parliament then sat, now demolished for the new courts of justice, "To publish his proclamation of universal toleration, and a general amnesty"—At this time the King being very feeble, was leaning upon his shoulder—(faithful remembrancer, p. 103)

Now to apply, Lord Granard sat uniformly in that parliament through the whole of the sessions, for he never quitted the King from his arrival in Ireland—lord Granard was an acknowledged protestant, and married to a presbyterian—he had refused to head the association of Ulster, against the King—and he was a constant attendant of the privy council—Is it then likely that this man would be privy to a general protestant proscription, and not reveal it?—and is it probable that such a SECRET CONSPIRACY BY WAY OF STATUTE could pass the houses of commons, and lords, the privy council, and finally the King, and that it never should come to the knowledge of a peer of parliament, a favourite of the court, a resident in Dublin, and every day attendant in his place in the upper house?

But admit for a moment the validity of the statute: execute it to the extremity of proscription and forfeiture: AND I WILL CONTRAST IT with the statutes of forfeiture of king William; and with the unparalleled proscriptions of Cromwell and his deputies, ANTECEDENT TO JAMES THE SECOND; and when the island was IN PROFOUND SUBJECTION.

And here, as a preface, I must arrest my pen, and address a few sentences to my *epicene correspondent*—Portia, you begun the attack: protestant bigotry sat brooding in the North, IN BELFAST THE

VERY



VERY SEAT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, THE VERY FORUM OF POLITICAL LIBERALITY; and the production when hatched, was this impeachment of the RIGHTS OF THE LIVING; this mighty imputation against the MEMORIES OF THE DEAD.

I address a pamphlet with my name annexed, to a body of liberal men: I crowd it with testimonies of rapacity and murder inflicted upon the conquered natives by our ancestors: I incontrovertibly prove that the Irish were a nation tyrannized over, and harrassed, from the usurpation of Henry the 2d. and the robberies of Strongbow, TO THE PERIOD OF REFORMATION: and that RELIGIOUS ANIMOSITY restoring exhausted vigour TO NATIONAL AVERSION, the Irish catholicks have endured a constant, unremitting, and hideous persecution, *on account of religion*, as well as for their lands, from the æra of Elizabeth—I adduced my authorities, I rendered my book tedious by the frequency of my quotations, I drew my conclusion, and I challenged its refutation by any OPEN ANTAGONISTS. And here steps forward an anonymous impeacher, *arrayed in jumps and a boddice, stiffened up with whalebone, and talking the language of a clerk of the crown*, championing me to a combat in the dark, and adducing in a few lines of a newspaper, ONE FACT as a refutation of my argument, founded upon authority suspicious, problematical, and exploded—and this MASK concludes with an *arrogant assumption of superiority*, as holding, out from its mysterious elevation “a gentle check” to the laborious researches of all who differ from it.

“Why, mighty spirit, dost thou hide, conceal’d?”

“At best seen dimly—in thy works reveal’d.”

I now proceed as Portia has demanded; probably farther than she expected; or is now, perhaps, perfectly historically prepared for—she has provoked a RECRIMINATION, from which she will find no refuge  
in

in *historical forgery*, or in the doublings of logical ingenuity. If recrimination be ungracious, Portia has extorted it, and I will furnish her with my authorities from whence she may search and refute me.—But I must also premise that, after the enormities I shall adduce, I believe the *object of wonder to our impartial perusers* will be, not that the catholics should have felt in 1689—every dictate of revenge and indignation for the series of rapines and slaughter, unparalleled but in Mexico, which they had endured for a century previous to this *imputed and no where to be found statute*; but that their astonishment and admiration will be excited by the TEMPERANCE, the MODERATION, the FORGIVENESS, and the SAGACITY of that illustrious, though hostile body, the parliament, who were assembled in the short session of king James—and the truth would appear to be, that the SUCCEEDING DEPREDACTIONS, OF KING WILLIAM, and the enormity of THEIR extent *required for a pretext*, some such forgery as may have been trumped up by the *accomodating* doctor King; and is now again REVIVED AND INTRODUCED IN MASQUERADE FROM BELFAST:—BUT LEVITY AND CONCEALMENT WERE ITS MOST SUITABLE GENTLEMEN USHERS.

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

## P A R T V.

THE task appears invidious which is to revive the errors of the dead: and could history, in the beautiful words of Dalrymple, confine herself to the recital of glorious actions alone, her pictures would be for ever pleasing: but if she pursues them to their conclusions THE SAD LOT OF HUMANITY tears down the beautiful trophies she has reared.—Yet the hour,  
I trust,



I trust, is rapidly approaching when *mutual acknowledgement of errors, and mutual forgiveness*, shall consign to oblivion *mine*, and all such ungracious recitations. — Let the Protestants do their part IN THIS GREAT WORK OF PEACE AND UNION, and come forward to meet the catholics, who have already performed theirs.

The frequency of falshood, and astonishing misrepresentation, exhibited in “The state of the Protestants, by archbishop King” as detailed by Leslie and continued by Curry, renders a recitation of *all the instances* totally beyond the compass of my present instructions: and a few leading illustrations, I flatter, myself will suffice to demolish his reputation as an authority of any credit.

Doctor King throughout his narrative represents the Irish, and the parliament of King James, as having been devoted to passive obedience, and to arbitrary power: and his Grace never reflects that their assertion of the independence of the Irish legislature, and their efforts for the repeal of the law of Poynings, measures, which HE UNIFORMLY STATES, AND UNIFORMLY CONDEMNNS AS CRIMINAL, throughout his book, is the most consummate refutation of this accusation which he publishes against them; and a conclusive evidence that they WERE NOT passively obedient, nor the willing tools of arbitrary power — But he shall speak for himself—

In his *imputed* “suggestions of the Irish Catholics to James,” doctor King advances that “THE POPISH RELIGION IS CONSONANT TO MONARCHY AND IMPLICIT OBEDIENCE.” — [Page 245.]

Now that “Monarchy and implicit obedience” should be thus coupled, is an ODLY worded accusation as proceeding from a Protestant Archbishop: For it is tantamount to an insinuation that *Monarchy* is not consistent with a *free government*: A doctrine which the establishment, the Dissenters, and the Ca-

E

tholics

tholics of Ireland POSITIVELY DENY: and doctor King by this strange junction of terms in his *accusation*, seems in his conversion from "NON-RESISTANCE" and "PRAYERS AND TEARS," to WHIGGISM, AND A BISHOPRICK, to have run, in his zeal, into *republicanism itself*.

No doubt of it, the principles of the parliament of James, were certainly monarchical, BECAUSE THEY RENOVATED THE OLD CONSTITUTION, but that their conduct testified any unworthy sacrifices to implicit *obedience*, can be for ever combated — Was it testified in their STATUTES, in their addresses, in their armies?

" King James preferred, and trusted the Irish rather than his Protestant and English subjects. The bargain between him and them was plainly this, Restore us to our former power, estates, and religion, and we will serve you as you please, IN YOUR OWN WAY"—[King, p. 29.]

" This parliament openly professed itself A SLAVE TO THE KING'S WILL: and he was looked on as factiously and rebelliously inclined that would dare to move any thing after any favourite in the house had affirmed, that it was contrary to the king's pleasure—" [King, p. 128.]

That the unfortunate James should confide in his Irish rather than in his English subjects who had ejected him, is not very extraordinary, nor can appear very culpable: and yet however probable, and excusable the fact, even that *accusation* is not true, for his great counsellor was Talbot, Lord Tyrconnel, a Shropshire gentleman of a noble family, who had been a colonel in his army, and was afterwards Lord Lieutenant.— But his Grace will confute himself: Hear him in another part of the work. — Speaking of the Protestant bishops who sat in King James's parliament, his Grace says " Doctor Dopping, bishop of Meath, doctor



doctor Otway, bishop of Ossory, doctor Digby, bishop of Limerick, and doctor Wetenhall, bishop of Cork, were obliged to appear upon their writs directed to them; and king James was forced sometimes to make use of them to moderate by way of counterpoise the madness of his own party, *when their votes displeased him.*" [King, p. 125.]

It appears, then, upon his Grace's *own authority*, that James sometimes *did trust* his protestant bishops, and used them as a counterpoise — and when did he use them? WHEN THE VOTES OF HIS OWN PARTY DISPLEASED HIM.

This is very odd—I thought *they were all slaves to the king's will*, and that they had made "*a bargain with James to serve him as he pleased, in his own way.*" Yet here we learn that "*the votes of his own party could so far displease him,*" as to throw him into the arms of four protestant bishops, for council and assistance. — These catholics were very odd sort of *slaves to the king's will*: To be POPISH SUBMISSION, it was as like WHIGGISH TURBULENCE, as a heretic like myself, could well desire. — What other test of *absolute opposition*, men in parliament could exhibit to their sovereign, but DISPLEASEING HIM WITH THEIR VOTES, unless being guilty of OPEN REBELLION, it might have posed doctor King to have left to us upon record, in his *decent, liberal, candid and christian* composition! — Portia's authority!

But we will hear his grace farther—"It was manifestly against James's interest to call a parliament, and much more unseasonable to pass SUCH ACTS in it [aye, there is what stuck in the ENGLISH doctor King's stomach, and in primate Boulter's after him]; as he knew the Papists expected — who would spend their time in wrangling about settling the kingdom, and disposing of estates — *His compliance with all the most extravagant demands of the Papists was unavoidable*, if he called a Parliament.—[King, 123-4.]

What,

What, a Parliament “*which openly professed itself a slave to the King’s will, and had “made a bargain with him to serve him as he pleased in his own way?”*—How is this reconcileable, Portia, with “*his compliance being unavoidable to all the most extravagant demands of the Papists?*”

But enough of *doctor King against doctor King*: I will now turn to a page of Dalrymple, of Barret, and of Leslie; *authorities* most opposite in principles political or religious; yet coinciding IN A REFUTATION OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF DOCTOR KING.—First premising to PORTIA, and to the other admirers of that archbishop, and of such calumniators of the Irish nation. THAT THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND WOULD NOT HAVE SUPPORTED JAMES IF HE HAD REFUSED TO CALL A PARLIAMENT: AND THAT THEY EXTORTED FROM HIM A RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THEIR COUNTRY, BEFORE THEY WOULD BESTOW UPON HIM EITHER SUBSIDY, OR SERVICE.

“I see,” said King James in disgust “when he was presented with the Navigation Bill, and the declaratory act of the independence of the legislature, *I see all Commons are the same!*—Testifying, unhappy man, the hereditary aversion of his family, though he was the honestest among them, to parliaments, and a constitution—[Earl of Melfort, Sir John Dalrymple, and State Letters.] And doctor King corroborates this himself in the following passage, “when the house of commons *crossed some proposal of James*, he was very much out of humour, and declared *that all Commons were the same, as he found BY THEM: and when they would not suffer him to dispense with their acts* he is said to have fallen into so violent a passion, that his nose fell a bleeding.”—[King’s Protestants, p. 32.]

This Catholic House of Commons undoubtedly chose a very extraordinary mode of testifying, “*That they*



*they were professed slaves to the King's will," and "that they had bargained with King James to serve him in his own way."*

One would be disposed to imagine that doctor King *never reviewed* his own book ; but added paragraph to paragraph, according to the spleen and bigotry of the hour ; and according to the *necessary* falsehood, and calumny of the day ; and dispatched it to the press FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF CHARTER SCHOOLS, AND THE EDIFICATION OF THE PROTESTANT YOUTH.

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T VI.

THE Archbishop has solemnly asserted " THAT THIS CATHOLIC PARLIAMENT DID OPENLY PROFESS ITSELF A SLAVE TO THE KING'S WILL" a heavy charge against a representative body—and his Grace has moreover stated " THAT THE KING SAT CONSTANTLY IN THE HOUSE AND DIRECTED THEIR DEBATES" (King's Protestants p. 126)—But all cotemporary historians contradict these degrading accusations—hear the language of their *declared enemies*.

" Upon King James's landing in Ireland, says Doctor Burnet, he marched his army from Kinsale to Ulster. It is true the Irish were as *insolent* as they were undisciplined ; and *they thought they must be masters of all the King's councils* — King James's party in Britain pressed his settling the affairs of Ireland *the best he could do*, and his bringing over the French *and such of the Irish AS HE COULD GOVERN*" —(Burnet's own Times—vol. 2d. p. 11.)

This does not resemble the implicit obedience of slaves, nor a blind submission *to the daily presence of a Despot*

*a Despot directing them debates.* And the following passages from Doctor Leslie will, I believe, be considered as a sufficient refutation of Doctor King's *historical integrity*, respecting his SLANDEROUS INVECTIVES against that memorable short Parliament.

"I appeal to the Earl of Granard, says Doctor Leslie, whether the Duke of Powes did not return him thanks from the King for the opposition he made in the House of Lords to the passing these bills; and desired that he, and the PROTESTANT Lords, should use their endeavours to obstruct them; — To which the Lord Granard answered, that they were too few to effect that; and if his Majesty wished them not to pass, his way was to engage some of the Catholic Lords to stop them: To this the Duke replied with an oath, "THAT THE KING DURST NOT LET THEM KNOW THAT HE HAD A MIND TO HAVE THEM STOPPED." (Leslie, page 99.)

Is this no REFUTATION of the veracity of Doctor King? or of his assertion "*that James's Parliament were avowed slaves to his will*"? — and yet we owe even these scattered evidences of Catholic independence (TRADUCED AS THEIR MEMORIES HAVE BEEN FOR AN AGE!) to the virulence against them of poor Leslie himself; who *English in all his prejudices*, thought it a stretch of unparalleled audacity FOR THE CATHOLICS TO ASSERT THAT THE CONSTITUTION OF IRELAND WAS INDEPENDENT OF THE BRITISH LEGISLATURE, more especially as the *succeeding Protestant Parliament* had made the English a polite bow, and given the *independence* back again.

But we will hear Leslie, in continuation: still beseeching my Belfast correspondent to keep in mind, that Archbishop King outlived Doctor Leslie's attack, thirty years; and silently submitted to the obloquy of every charge.

"I further appeal, says Leslie, to the Lord Granard, whether as his Lordship was passing to the Parliament



liament house, he did not meet King James, who asked him where he was going? His Lordship answered, to enter his protestation against the repeal of the acts of settlement: upon which King James told him "*that he was fallen into the hands of people who rammed that, and many other things down his throat.*" —(Leslie, page 100.)

Yet according to the accusations of the UNCANDID Archbishop, "*This was the Parliament which James absolutely ruled, sitting constantly in the House, AND DIRECTING THEIR DEBATES.*"

In a succeeding page of Leslie treating of *the repeal of the acts of settlement*, is the following extraordinary APOSTROPHE TO JUSTICE, as proceeding from the pen of that prejudiced, but conscientious divine; which being short, I will recite, though it is not immediately applicable to my present pursuit—the passage is creditable to Leslie's candour, and is honorable to the Catholics as proceeding from their avowed enemy.

"I never heard any Protestant say but that there were MANY HARD CASES and EVEN UNJUST in the acts of settlement: and will any one say that *such as shall appear to be injured ought not to be redressed?* This would be to plead against reason, and justice, and likewise against the public good—I am told that King James's meaning was, to have a sum of money raised for such as had been injured by the act of settlement; but by no means to encroach upon the acts—and what fault could Doctor King have found with this? — UNLESS HE THINKS THAT JUSTICE OUGHT NOT TO BE DONE TO THE IRISH; OR NOT TO BE EXECUTED AGAINST PROTESTANTS." (Leslie, p. 101.)

Deplorable situation of the calumniated Catholics! —The learned Archbishop, on one hand, pronounces, that this CATHOLIC PARLIAMENT, out did all others in baseness, for that it "*openly professed itself a slave*

to the King's will :” While upon the other, they are reproached by Leslie as having been TURBULENT AND UNACCOMMODATING, making loyalty their pretence, but their own general interest their real motive—as sacrificing the *Empire* to the exclusive interests of the *Island*.

But though, long since, themselves, beyond the reach of calumny, or admiration, LATE TRUTH begins to beam upon their clouded glory!—Their MEMORIES again begin to revive in *some* grateful bosoms!—and extorted admiration NOW bears testimony to their immortal though successful VIRTUE, even from one of the pens of their hereditary oppressors.

According to the authority of the researching Dalrymple, to whom the *Irish* stand as little indebted for compliments as to their other protestant historians, “ King James found the appearances in Ireland favourable—*The Papists frantic with joy at the prospect of independence upon Britain*—yet James continued irresolute: and Lord Dundee pressed him from Scotland to embark with his army for that country, in which there were no regular troops: and where hosts of Shepherds would start up warriors at the very first transient glimmer of his banner weaving upon their mountains.—(Sir J. Dalrymple—Memoirs of G. B. and J. in 1689.)

This *frantic joy* did not favour much of being DEVOTED SLAVES TO THE KING'S WILL; because *Irish independence* was ruinous to his *English interest*—and “ James's Irish Parliament passed an act which asserted the independence of the Irish Legislature, and of their courts of justice, upon those of England—*measures which were only wanting to render James completely odious to his British Parliament.*”—(Ralph's public papers.)

“ Many and foul are the representations,” says Doctor Curry, “ of the Irish Catholics, exhibited in Archbishop King's state of the Protestants of Ireland  
under



'under James II.' [Vol. 2. p. 143.] And that his Grace was capable of *traduction*, and *wilful misrepresentation*, has been exhibited in this my *tedious recital*. — To enter upon a circumstantial refutation of his HISTORY, and to combat, in succession, the authenticity of all his FACTS, would swell into a volume as bulky as his own. His object appears to have been *an adherence to EITHER CROWNED HEAD* which should be superior in the contest; and to *ASPERSE THE VANQUISHED*, in order to render the appearance of *his own desertion*, decent and necessary.

In my next continuation, I will under the head of that RECRIMINATION which my Belfast correspondent has extorted, take a review of the remaining leading falsehoods, cruelly and unjustly transmitted to posterity by Archbishop King, for the purpose of vilifying a PEOPLE whose virtues were worthy of *imitation, of better times, and of a happier fate!* whose mistakes were pardonable, and whose COMPARATIVE VIOLENCES WERE PROVOKED AND FEW.

Doctor King asserts to the world "that when the Papists of Ireland had got judges and juries who would believe them, they began a trade of swearing, and ripping up what their Protestant neighbours had said of King James when Duke of York — That many of these Protestants were *excessively fined*, and some of them imprisoned for their fees, not being able to satisfy the King, who seized both their body and estates — and that these Popish Judges, and Juries contrived to carry on this trade of swearing against all the Protestant gentlemen of the county."

—[King, p. 75, 76.]

Now, Henry, Lord Clarendon, the Lord Lieutenant, relates, "that when the Popish Judges went on circuit into Down and Derry, where, among other offences, some persons were to be tried for treasonable words formerly spoken against King James,

F

they

—they took care to have *all the Juries mingled, half English, half Irish.*—State Letters, vol. I. p. 336.]

“ Judge Daly, one of these Popish Judges, did enlarge much at the assize in Meath, upon the unconscionableness of indicting men upon words spoken so many years before ; and thereupon the Juries did acquit them.” —[Lord Clarendon’s State Letters, vol. I. p. 328.]

“ Mr. Justice Nugent, a Roman Catholic, did make the same declaration at Drogheda, where certain persons were tried for words spoken ; and they were all acquitted, except one man, who was fined five pounds.” —[Same volume, p. 329.]

But Lord Clarendon, by James’s express command, had in a proclamation, which bears date July 1686, *only three months* after the appointment of the Popish Judges, *which was the 12th of April*, PROHIBITED ALL PROSECUTIONS OF THAT KIND ; and ordering that no person should be made accountable for any words spoken against his Majesty, *at any time before his accession.*—[State Letters, vol. I. p. 324— and Appendix.]

Of all these facts Doctor King *was in possession ; and industriously suppressed them ;* for at the period of their transactions, 1686, he was *first Chaplain* to Lord Clarendon, and a very busy enquirer into the occurrences of the times : It is therefore, scarcely possible that the moderation of those Popish Judges *should be matter worthy of the notice of the Lord Lieutenant, and his transmittal to England to Lord Sunderland,* yet that the first Chaplain should never hear of any such matter : but that Doctor King should have been totally ignorant of the PROCLAMATION, is incredible, and *inadmissible.*—Indeed, his want of christian fairness, and justice between man and man, is peculiarly evident here ; for *the singular propriety, modesty, and temperate demeanor* of the Popish Judges, both in their *offices*, and as *Privy Counsellors*, is much dwelt



dwelt upon, and is candidly, and honourably detailed by LORD CLARENDON to Lord Sunderland in the State Letters.—[Vol. I. p. 231, and 232.]

Yet, Lord Clarendon was so *zealous* a Protestant as to entertain suspicions that he had been recalled from the government, by some persons near the King *on account of his religion*.—"If," says his Lordship, "my being a Protestant be the cause of my ill usage, I look upon it as a great honour to be found worthy to suffer for my religion."—[State Letters, vol. II. p. 158.]—And Mr. Harris states, "That Lord Clarendon *was so much depended upon by the Protestants of Ireland*, that after the Prince of Orange's arrival in England, all their application was made to the Prince through his Lordship."—[Harris's Life of King William, p. 187.]—Yet this *Protestant Protector* bears his ample testimony to the justice and moderation of *these very Popish Judges*, who, without any qualification of exception, or mistake, are stigmatized by Dr. King as "THE WICKED CONTRIVERS OF PLANS TO SWEAR AWAY THE LIVES OF ALL THE PROTESTANT GENTLEMEN IN THE COUNTRY."

The trouble I have already given myself, and possibly without readers, has not been suggested by any immediate direction to the popular topics of the hour. — I have committed my enquiries to the press for the purpose of invalidating by *anticipation* certain erroneous, Protestant, literary authorities: FOR WHEN THAT AUSPICIOUS DAY ARISES ON WHICH THE FRANCHISE OF FIVE MILLIONS OF SUBJECTS IN HIS MAJESTY'S BRITISH ISLES SHALL BE THE SUBJECT OF UNSHACKLED AND IMPARTIAL DEBATE, the volumes of Doctor King will be the text book of intolerance, and the last forlorn hope of expiring bigotry.

With this object in view, I acceded to the anonymous challenge from Belfast, as a medium through which I would commence *a refutation of Doctor King*:  
the

the idea of undertaking which I have entertained for some years back, and which the retired oblivion of my life has afforded me liberty to pursue. — This has been my motive for replying so much at large to a newspaper squib; and also to testify, that I am not *unprepared* for an OPEN and candid controversy. — I do not dabble with the selfishness, nor write to support PARTY: My principle is to do justice, to love mercy, and to investigate truth.

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T VII.

THE present important object of our Catholic fellow-subjects, is A SHARE IN THE LEGISLATION OF THEIR COUNTRY, AND A PARTICIPATION IN ALL THE BLESSINGS OF A FREE CONSTITUTION. — The question is of that magnitude, as to stand upon its own peculiar grounds, JUSTICE, and the SPIRIT OF OUR GOVERNMENT: And, it is, therefore, little relative to so honourable a pursuit, what our ancestors of *either side* may have inflicted, or may have suffered, from the poison of MUTUAL intolerance, and MUTUAL barbarism; because human opinions, temptations, and actions vary with varying times; they brutalize in a barbarous period of manners, and spiritualize, and soften under the influence of polish, and philosophy —

But prejudices dictate reproaches, and reproaches provoke RECRIMINATION: The PREJUDICE of *this Century* has been that the Irish Protestant was a lamb-like victim, and the Catholic a tyger, delighting in human blood. — It has been my weak, but well-meant endeavour, therefore, for more than ten years, to illustrate THAT THE PROTESTANTS OF THE ISLAND

HAVE



HAVE BEEN PERSECUTORS, AND THE CATHOLICS, POLITICAL MARTYRS; and also to acknowledge, that the Catholics, in the short hour of prosperity, which they enjoyed amid the pitiful series of their eventful history, may have been violent; *certainly were Patriotic*: That though they might have hated the Protestants, they ADORED LIBERTY: That if with one hand they indiscreetly levelled the maurus under Cromwell, yet animated with an heroic devotion to FREEDOM, they erected HER TEMPLE with the other.—I hat with a Theban fortitude against the Xerxes of the hour, who leading his BRITISH Persians had landed upon their country, their only care was NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE.—And that with the ancient ardour of the CATHOLICS at Runnimead, *many of them their ancestors*, in the midst of their own uncertainty, and of *his* embarrassments, THEY EXTORTED A CONSTITUTION FROM THEIR KING.

THEIR THREE HUNDRED STATUES OUGHT TO BE CONSPICUOUS UPON YOUR NEWLY-TO-BE-ERECTED SENATE, AND A PAGAN DEVOTION OUGHT TO BEND TO THEM EVERY IRISH KNEE!!

It is of small relation to the question *whether the Parliament of James the Second asserted a constitution, afterwards to be destroyed by their successors*, that they should have been subject to the tide of human passion. If they *did not enact* the statute of Attainder, they were superior to human frailty: and if they *did enact it*, they were no worse than men: an act which *in its most extensive operation*, as recited by the invidious King, was EXCEEDED by William, and his Protestant Partizans.

Granting, therefore, for a moment, the validity of this imputed Bill, I will demand of my Belfast assailant, *was it just, or was it not?*—Does my challenger

lenger detest the example, or approve of the IMITATION? —Portia will chuse — she will then peruse the *following declaration of Bishop Burnet*, the confident of the Prince of Orange, and the champion of the *glorious memory*: she will next have recourse to a *subsequent passage in Dalrymple*: and lastly, to fill up the measure of Protestant enormities, she will turn to the *violation of the Articles of Limerick*: and to the *code of Penal Statutes*, AS THEY NOW EXIST!! — Though there is no corroborating evidence of Doctor King's assertion, yet I might admit the fact, for the condemnation of my antagonist; to testify that though my challenger affects to dogmatize as from an elevation of UNASSAILABLE PURITY, *Protestant oppression improved in barbarity upon the example it presumes to reprobate*; and that its *profligate breach of faith* is stamped upon PARLIAMENTARY RECORD.

The Bishop of Sarum thus delivers himself—(Burnet, Vol. 2d. fol. p. 39) “The House of Commons passed a vote to raise a million of money out of the forfeitures and confiscations in Ireland—and in order to that, THEY PASSED A BILL OF ATTAINDER OF ALL those who had been engaged in the rebellion of Ireland, and appropriated the confiscations to the raising a fund for defraying the expence of the war—upon this bill MANY PETITIONS WERE OFFERED, from the creditors of some, and the heirs of others WHO HAD CONTINUED FAITHFUL TO THE GOVERNMENT, *desiring provisos for their security*—But the Commons seeing there was no end of Petitions for such provisos, REJECTED THEM ALL; imitating in this too much the mock Parliament held in Dublin, in which 3000 persons were attainted.”

Now pray observe—First, here was an Attainder of ALL THOSE who had engaged in rebellion; which was a sweeping clause more cruel than any contained in the bill imputed, by King, to James's Parliament—Secondly, “It was of all who had been engaged  
in



*in rebellion*”—In what rebellion?—Did they mean rebellion *against a Dutch Prince*—or against a *British House of Commons*? In support of their natural Sovereign who had fled to them for protection from his English rebellious subjects:—York and Lancaster called their mutual Partizans, *rebels*, because each pretended an hereditary right, and both were of one stock—Queen Elizabeth called the King of Ulster a *rebel*, before he had even acknowledged her Sovereignty; but then a considerable part of the Island, had——Cromwell peopled the West Indies, and CHOAKED UP the Boyne and the Shannon, with Irishmen whom he called *rebels*: but even that sanguinary enthusiast had so much colour of pretence, as that the delegated Government of the Island had been a considerable time previous to his coming, in the hands of Deputies appointed by the British Commonwealth—But how the English Protestants sending to Holland for the Prince of Orange could constitute the Irish Catholics, *REBELS*, when in arms beneath the Banner, and in the presence of their hereditary Sovereign, and fighting for him, and for the independence of their country, was a doctrine of AUDACITY and INJUSTICE reserved for the illustration of this modest, Protestant, British Parliament; and for their new Dutch King.—

(Macpherson's Hist. of Great Britain, Vol. 2d. p. 161.) “By the report laid before the English House of Commons by Mr. Annesley in 1700, it appeared that THREE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE PERSONS had been outlawed by King William SINCE THE 13TH FEBRUARY 1688.”

Now, here is an outlawry of Irishmen commencing from a date *prior* to the possibility of treasons against the Prince of Orange: AND PRIOR TO THE IMPUTED ACT OF ATTAINDER by the Irish Parliament of James; which did not sit *till May* 1689—a year and four months posterior to these outlawries by the British Parliament

Parliament and sanctioned by King William! — Oh Justice, oh conscience, oh modesty, in what region of the Protestant ascendancy do you now reside?

But to return to my text—"This report made by the Commissioners (continues Macpherson) says 13th February, 1688; And that all the lands belonging to forfeited persons, amounted to more than one million and sixty thousand acres: that the most considerable grants were made *to persons born in foreign countries*; and that upon the whole, the value of Irish forfeitures amounted to three millions, three hundred and nineteen thousand, nine hundred forty pounds." [Vol. 2d. p. 262.]

In corroboration of this authority, the state trials relate, (Critical Review of the State Trials, Parliamentary Impeachment of Lord Halifax, Vol. 2d. page 743. Dublin Edit. fol.) "To the Lord Portland, a Dutchman, his Majesty granted out of the forfeited estates in Ireland, 135,810 acres—to the Earl of Albemarle, a Dutchman, he granted, 108,633 acres—to the Earl of Athlone, a Dutchman, he granted 26,480 acres—to the Earl of Galway, a Frenchman, he granted 36,148 acres—and to the Lady Elizabeth Villars his Majesty granted 95,649."

Which grants of King William to these five persons, Keppel, Bentick, Ginckle, Rouvigny, and Villars, amounted in all to four hundred and two thousand, seven hundred, and thirty-one acres—ALMOST AN ELEVENTH PART OF THE ISLAND!—There was Protestant ascendancy with a vengeance!—nor can my unbigotted, but perhaps short-sighted mind comprehend, that there was greater enormity in King James bestowing *Irish lands upon Irish natives* than in King William lavishing them in such EXTRAVAGANT PROPORTION upon FOUR foreign adventurers, and one kept mistress.

The letter which I addressed to the Belfast societies, and which was productive of the present anonymous



mous attack, I consider *as an honest Protestant manifesto in exculpation of the Irish for the imputed cruelties of 1641*: And I have bestowed some additional labour upon this small work, *as an illustration of their conduct in 1689*. Whatever cruelties are imputable to them, and whatever excesses they committed during the first period, have been magnified by Temple, fifty fold: And Doctor King, and Doctor Story adopted Temple for their guide, and in calumny, and exaggeration, improved upon their model.

The famous high-churchman, Doctor Brett, speaking of 1641, *and abusing the Catholics*, admits “that it was impossible so many thousands as the cotemporary historians all assert, could have been massacred—*Sir John Temple’s account exceeds all belief*, insomuch that it is not clear whether there were, indeed, so many Protestants existing at the time *in the whole kingdom*; and it is plain that by the fury of Sir Charles Coote, and our other commanders, sufficient reprisals were made, *and as many with equal barbarity*, murdered by the English—see Cartes Ormond, and Warden’s rebellion.”—[Brett’s Judgment of Truth—page 82.]

But had all these imputed extravagancies of the Irish Catholics really been perpetrated, they were pointed out the way, they were taught the trade, they were instructed in slaughter, by English oppression, and Protestant bigotry.

The intemperance of our Protestant ancestors is fully illustrated by the statutes of Elizabeth, of James, and the other Stewarts, and by the relation of those bigotted men in authority, themselves, Temple, Borlase and others, who vauntingly chronicled their own disgrace—and here is upon this head of PROTESTANT INTOLERANCE OF ANY RELIGION BUT ITS OWN, a very curious, interesting, and conclusive passage re-

cited by Mr. Bayle in his fifth volume, folio, p. 526, English edition.

I have already observed in my Letter to the Societies, that in 1726, Lord Falkland proposed to the Irish Parliament “ that the Papists should be permitted the public exercise of their religion provided they could pay the necessary sums for the subsistence of the national forces,”—which sums were at that time RIGOROUSLY levied off them, by Statute, *as a tax, for not attending the Sundays, and festivals of the established Church*; and had arisen, *as I have there stated from authorities*, into a most grievous taxation, and heavy oppression: for it operated in TWO CRUEL WAYS, it impoverished their fortunes, and prohibited them the exercise of their religion.—Upon this occasion, therefore, the Catholics gladly coincided with this proposal of the Lord Deputy, and were willing to bear the whole weight of the maintenance of the army, PROVIDED THEY WERE PERMITTED TO WORSHIP GOD.

Upon this fair proposal being heard in Parliament, “ Archbishop Usher, [says Bayle, upon the authority of Batefon’s *Vita Ufferii*, page 742, a book I never saw] assembled all the Bishops of his Province, and drew up a declaration which they all signed.—It imported that considering the falsity of the doctrine of the Papists, *it would be a great sin to permit the exercise of such a Religion* ;” all this is related in stronger terms, in the following passage from Batefon.—“ The most revered Prelate assembled all his suffragans, who with an unanimous consent drew up, and signed a remonstrance, wherein they declared, *how impious it would be to grant an indulgence of that nature*,” in words to the following purpose.—“ That, whereas the religion of the Papists was superstitious and idolatrous, it would be a great sin to indulge them in the exercise of their Faith and Doctrine,—  
both



both because such a thing would involve us in the guilt of all the abominations of Popery, and make us accessory *to the ruin of all such as should perish in that flood of apostacy*, and also, because, to do it for the sake of money, would be setting religion to sale, and betraying for hire, the souls which Jesus Christ has redeemed with his precious blood—Wherefore they prayed the God of Truth, that he would endow them with a zeal for the Glory of God, and fortify them against all Popery and Idolatry—There were twelve Bishops subscribed this Remonstrance; and Downham, Bishop of Derry, when preaching before Lord Falkland, and the Privy Council, took occasion to read it in the middle of his Sermon: Nay, the Archbishop himself, the next Lord's day, preaching before the same personages, approved of the Remonstrance, insinuating at the same time, THAT THE VENGEANCE OF GOD THREATENED THE NATION, FOR ENTERTAINING SUCH A DESIGN.—“Thus far Bateson—and it is observable, continues Bayle, that Archbishop Usher, and his Diocesans, *here acted according to the most rigid principles of the ENEMIES OF TOLERATION.*”—I need not add, that the *proposal* received a *direct, and an insulting refusal from the Government?*

Now, did ever mortal hear such a farago of puritanism, intolerance, and superstition, lording it, in the insignia of temporal authority, over the consciences, and purses of a MAJORITY of the Island!—Ten bills of attainder, would have been only a *pardonable retaliation* for a tyranny spiritual and temporal, so daring, and audacious.—What majority of free minds, when harrassed by a persecution as insolent, as unchristian, would not madden at the oppression; or BE JUSTIFIED IN REPELLING IT, when the vicissitudes of times afforded them opportunity?

But we will take one more transient view of this spiritual intolerance. When that unfortunate young Nobleman

Nobleman Lord Macguire an hereditary Peer of the Irish Realm, was tried by a Middlesex Jury for imputed treasons committed in Ireland, and was drawn on a hurdle, and hanged like a dog at Tyburne; in his last melancholy moments, without a friend to sooth, or a Priest to spiritually console him, the fanatical villain who obtruded himself upon his Lordships devotions, had the unparalleled barbarity to address him, "Mr. Macguire, it is not your Ave Marias will do you any good." — Lord Macguire, "For Jesus Christ's sake! I beseech you to give me a little time to prepare myself!"

The Sheriff (another *tolerating* protestant) then searched his pockets, and found his rosary, beads and the crucifix, *which he immediately took away from him*, telling him "you must either go to Heaven or Hell, if you make not an ingenious confession—your case is desperate; do you account the shedding of Protestant blood to be a sin, or not?" "Lord Macguire," *I think the Irish had a just cause for their wars: For God's sake have pity upon me! and let me say my prayers!*"

And all this while (says my author, the humane, and *truth-telling*, Sir John Temple) his eye was fixed upon his papers, *mumbling* over something out of them," (that is, he was *praying* according to the forms of his own church,) "*whereupon one of the Sheriffs demanding his papers from him, he flung them down?—and so was executed!*"

It appears from the recital of the execution by Temple, and in the State Trials, that his Friends, Priests, and all the Catholics were forcibly excluded from approaching him at the gallows — The great Harrington forgot himself so far and could so sink the Champion of the Constitution in the Protestant persecutor as to sit as one of his jurors, and to murder an Irish Baron—and perhaps there is something *uncommonly affecting* (over-looking the little speculative



tive matters of holy stones, and reliques) in the following letter found in his Lordship's pocket ; which would seem to have been dictated by the lingering affection of some faithful domestic to his lost friend, and protector, now in the extremity of degradation, and of human misery, amid the tyranny of these fanatical, republican savages—(*The Coach* mentioned, I apprehend, was to carry away his Lordship's dead body.)

“ Most Loving Sir,

“ The coach shall wait on you infallibly—that day *your friend William* shall go by the coach all the way, upon a red horse, with a white hat, and in a grey Jacket, and then you cannot chuse but to know the coach, and two whitish horses, and then you may show *that token* only as to lift up your hand to your face, or inclining down your head, nodding. I send you this holy stone, by virtue whereof you may gain a plenary physic in saying any certain prayer. I do beseech you dear Lord, be of good courage for you shall not want any thing for that happy journey : and do you offer yourself wholly for him who did the same for you : pray earnestly for your country, and for your son, that God may prosper them. I do most humbly intreat you to pray for me, your own poor afflicted servant,

Your poor GRAY.”

There followed a line in the Irish character composed of seven words, which translated, is

*My thousand blessings unto you, son of my soul !*

The trial at large is worthy of perusal.—This short extract will exhibit that Lord Macguire, and along with him another Irish spiritual Lord, of illustrious birth, Doctor Plunket Primate of Ireland, and uncle to Lord Dunsany, were executed in London in violation of their rank, and in the teeth of the constitution

tution of Ireland : and that the PROTESTANT INTOLERANT BIGOTRY of the times *disturbed* and *persecuted* their last gaspings of existance!—Let no man, therefore, amid the present diffusion of philosophy, and dawning of universal tolleration, retain so much of “ the old leaven ” as to pronounce that cruelty, and persecution, that robberies and attainders, are the *exclusive* characteristics of EITHER RELIGION.—Such disgraces of human nature, are the vices, and the errors of the times ; the consequences of the darkness and savageness of the *periods of society* in which they were perpetrated.

As the morning of humanity dawned, the QUAKERS rose ! and *practical* christianity floated upon the turbulence of human gall ; and smoothed the waves of savage passion—*may they never forget, nor forego their pre-eminence in brotherly affection : nor estates and possessions* induce them to be TYRANTS ; or to erase from their christian escutcheon, the motto of Mr. Penn, the ornament of human nature, and the sanctifier of their society, “ *as you would be done by, do !* ”

But my Belfast challenger will tell me that the execution of Lord Macguire, and of Archbishop Plunket, were on account of *imputed treasons* : and that PROTESTANT religious intolerance at their deaths only exhibited itself by the bye.—Now, not to mention one word of Protestant Doctor Calvin roasting protestant Doctor Servetus at Rotterdam, with very great pomp, and regularity, because he was so impolite as to deny some of the new speculations ; nor of the Protestant Bishop Latimer, “ who preached patience to Friar Forest, while *agonizing under the torture of a slow fire*, for denying Henry 8ths supremacy ; ” nor of the Protestant Archbishop Cranmer, who compelled Edward 6th, to sign the warrant for burning at the stake, Joanna Boucher, a silly woman,” as Stowe has it ; let us hear what the venerable Penant recites, in his last beautiful and moral production,



tion, regarding the *wholesome Protestant doctrine* of conversion, as performed with much applause at London by those two pillars of Protestantism, Elizabeth, and James the First.

“ Our gracious Elizabeth could likewise burn people for religion ; two Dutchmen, anabaptists, suffered in this place (Smithfield) in 1575, and died as Holinshed sagely remarks, “ with roaring and crying.”—Nor can we deny that Elizabeth made a very free use of *the terrible act of her 27th year*,—a hundred and sixty-eight persons suffered in her reign at London, York, in Lancashire, and other parts of the Kingdom, convicted of being Priests, of harbouring Priests, or of becoming converts to Popery, (all which were crimes punished with death), — the last person who suffered at the stake in England as a heretick, was Batholomew Legatt, who was burned at Smithfield in 1611, according to the sentence pronounced by John King, (Protestant) Bishop of London.—The Bishop consigned him to the secular arm of our Monarch James 1st, who took care to give to the sentence, its full effect.” — (Pennant’s London, page 190.)

Bloody Mary, every child is well read in : she had three heads and nine horns : and her husband Philip always breakfasted upon a Heretic, during his residence at London : But let these bloody folks have roasted as they pleased, Mr. Pennant illustrates that *the Protestant ascendancy* was completely up with them, in the two succeeding reigns ; one hundred and sixty-eight Papists comfortably broiled, was a sufficient feast, in conscience for the *Protestant Virgin Queen* : and the *Protestant James* would have roasted *any thing*, except Carr and Villiers.

Again, therefore, I repeat, that all such excesses whether of brother Peter, or brother Martin, *are imputable to the barbarism, and ferocity of the periods of society* which were stained by their perpetration ;  
that

that they did not originate in the religion itself ; but that barbarism tainted the religion : and that if it had not been for the influence of religion, the times would have been many degrees more sanguinary, and savage.

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T VIII.

BY the tyranny of a Protestant ascendancy, Lord Maguire, an IRISH PEER, was tried by a JURY at WESTMINSTER, and EXECUTED AT TYBURN for imputed treasons, committed WITHIN THE REALM OF IRELAND : and HARRINGTON, the author of *Oceana*, and the Oracle of Liberty FORGOT THE PHILOSOPHY OF HIS CHARACTER, THE RESPECT DUE TO A PEER, AND REVERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND SAT UPON A JURY WHICH WAS TO MURDER AN IRISH BARON.

What blinded the great Harrington to commit this violation of law ? It was RELIGIOUS INTOLLERANCE ; the PROTESTANT SPIRIT OF PERSECUTION of the times. — Let no men ever throw the burthen of EXCLUSIVE PERSECUTION upon the British and Irish *Catholics*. The British and Irish PROTESTANTS have had an ample share of the guilt. The account, therefore, IS BALANCED between them : both have been guilty, but the crime did not proceed from religion : It is imputable to the barbarism and ferocity of THE TIMES.

We are instructed in our tender years that the Irish were barbarous, unlettered, and cruel : Yet there is infinite *sentiment* in the little *trait of recognition* prescribed in the above letter to Lord Macguire, which speaks a refinement of mind, and a SENSIBILITY, not to have been expected amid the general barbarism



barbarism of *that period*. Had the man, by whom it was written, and the man to whom it was directed been victorious, *they never could* have ordered a soldier to spit in the face of Charles the First, a person who had once been their sovereign, after he was condemned! — So that upon the score of BARBARISM, the account with the English Protestants seems to be *ballanced*. Also,

Had the Parliament of James the Second, in 1689, THIRSTED AFTER HUMAN GORE, they could but have trodden in the footsteps of the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY, in the person of Sir William Cole, in 1641, among whose boasted exploits we find, “that within a few months, he had starved and famished *five thousand, four hundred, and fifty-seven* of the Irish.” — [Borlace, p. 96.] — THEY COULD BUT FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE of the *implacable* Ireton in 1650, to the garrison of Limerick, who when they turned out *their useless and aged*, “that barbarous commander,” says Dr. Curry “caused some of them to be *executed*, and the rest to be *whipped back* into the town.” — But what is still more disgraceful to humanity, and to the *Protestant ascendancy*, Edmond Ludlow, who was a gentleman, a learned, liberal, and DEVOUT PROTESTANT, relating this cruel outrage, appears to dwell upon it with complacency. — “Great numbers of people endeavouring to get out of Limerick, the deputy, Ireton, threatened to shoot any who should attempt it! but this not being effectual, he caused two, or three, to be taken out to be executed, and the rest to be whipped back into the town; — one of those that was to be hanged was the *daughter* of an old man, who was among those to be sent back: He desired he might be hanged in the room of his daughter, but that was refused, and he, with the rest, was driven back into the town.” — [General Ludlow’s Memoirs, folio, page 142.]

H

THEY

THEY COULD BUT IMITATE that sanguinary rebel Michael Jones at his defeat of the Duke of Ormond, at Rathmines 1649, who according to Ormond's letter, "slew six hundred in that engagement, some upon the spot, and in the after pursuit; BUT THE GREATEST PART AFTER THEY HAD LAID DOWN THEIR ARMS UPON PROMISE OF QUARTER, and had been for almost an hour, *Prisoners* — and divers of them were MURDERED, after they were brought within the walls of Dublin—" [Carte's Original Papers, vol. 2d. p. 397.] These men so slaughtered, were all IRISH CATHOLICS fighting for THEIR KING, under his Lieutenant — and Doctor Leland himself, *reluctantly* acknowledges, that "fifteen hundred private foldiers, and three hundred officers were made prisoners — about *six hundred were slain; many of these*, to the disgrace of their conquerors, WHEN THEY HAD OBTAINED QUARTER, AND LAID DOWN THEIR ARMS.—[Leland, vol. 3d. p. 346.]

I repeat, that had this Parliament of James in 1689, given the rein to every savage dictate of human vengeance, *they could not have exceeded, they could only have trodden* in the Godly paths of that able preacher, and general, Cromwell himself, "who always exhorted his foldiers that the IRISH ought in duty to God to be dealt with like the Canaanites of old, in Joshua's time."—Doctor Anderson's Royal Genealogies, p. 786.]

I have been already, in my letter to the Belfast Societies, so tiresomely diffuse, respecting the PROTESTANT HUMANITIES of this extraordinary, and wicked man, that I shall intrude now with only two mild specimens of the *Protestant Ascendancy*, under his pious auspices — Cromwell landed at Dublin on the fifteenth of August, and marched to Drogheda with twelve thousand troops, which he reduced by storm on the 2d September, 1649. — "His officers and foldiers *had promised quarter* to such of the gar-  
rison



rison as would lay down their arms, and PERFORMED IT, as long as any place held out; which encouraged others to yield — But having once got all in their power, Cromwell and Jones agreed, *that they had now the flower of the Irish Army in their hands*, and that it would be wise to issue orders, *that no quarter should be given*; so that multitudes of the soldiers *were compelled to kill their prisoners.*—[Carte's Ormond, vol. 2d. p. 44.—and Leland, vol. 3d. p. 350.]—And the Marquis of Ormond in a letter to Lord Byron upon this occasion says, “Cromwell exceeded even himself at *Drogheda*, in bloody inhumanity, and breach of faith—and that the cruelties exercised there FOR FIVE DAYS AFTER THE TOWN WAS TAKEN, would make as many pictures of inhumanity as the Martyrs, or the cruelties by the Dutch at Amboyna.”—[Carte's Collection of Original Papers, vol. 2d.]—and Dr. Curry says, “In this carnage at *Drogheda*, OUT OF THREE THOUSAND, Cromwell only left THIRTY alive; *and these he transported to Barbadoes.*”—Now that was going *beyond* what Joshua did to the Canaanites, according to his own exhortation; but, probably, he represented to his Protestant Saints, that a greater than Joshua was there.

“At *Drogheda*, says Carte, the brave Governor, Sir Arthur Aston, Sir Edward Verney, Colonel Warren, Colonel Fleming, and Colonel Byrne, were slaughtered IN COLD BLOOD; and, indeed, all the officers, except some few of the least consideration, who *escaped by miracle,*” (Ormond's Life, vol. 2d. p. 84) and thus the *Protestant ascendancy* under Cromwell “FINDING THE FLOWER OF THE IRISH ARMY IN THEIR HANDS”—perfidiously sacrificed the honour of soldiers, and the HUMANITY OF CHRISTIANS, to a revengeful, and a cruel policy: and that these savage republicans constituted the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY of that period, is evident from the recorded vote upon the journals of the *Irish Convent*

in 1697, where grateful mention is made "of the very great, and signal services done by Lieutenant General Jones, in reducing Ireland to the obedience of England." (Commons Journals, vol. 2d. p. 864) Pray observe, "*To the obedience of England*"—That is, in one breath, the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY returned *thanks* to a daring rebel; and the SERVICE for which they thanked him was, THE SERVITUDE OF THEIR COUNTRY—I had two ancestors in that Parliament, sitting for Lisburn, and I most keenly feel the degradation of the descent.

The other illustration of the EXAMPLE set by Protestants to the Catholics of 1689 *if they had chosen to pursue it*, is the conduct of Cromwell at Wexford in 1649, full forty years previous to the Parliament of King James.

The town of Wexford, says Borlace, was betrayed to Cromwell by Governor Stafford, "which Cromwell having once gained, advanced his flag upon the Castle, and turned the guns against the town; and upon his soldiers entering it without resistance, *all found in arms were put to the sword to the number of TWO THOUSAND*, the terms offered by Colonel Synott, in the name of the inhabitants, were, THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE PERMISSION TO EXERCISE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION, that all freemen should have their liberties, and immunities hitherto enjoyed, they adhering to the state of England, that none should be disturbed in their possessions—all which (says Borlace vauntingly,) Cromwell COUNTED IMPUDENT AND THEY HAD NO EFFECT." (Borlace's Irish Rebel. p. 284) -- Yet Borlace in the same page *had just before said* that, "Synott's Commissioners treating with Cromwell, had PROCURED THE SAFETY of the inhabitants of the town, and preservation of it from plunder, as well as safety to the soldiers, they engaging not to bear arms against the states of England," and he immediately adds, "that Cromwell's  
soldiers



soldiers clapped scaling ladders to the walls, and *entered the town without any resistance*: whereupon two thousand were put to the sword; and among them Sir Edmond Butler was slain, before he had been two hours in the City — *Cromwell in the interim not losing TWENTY MEN in the whole siege.* (Borlace, p. 284, 285)—which last circumstance is a conclusive evidence of the butchery of the horrid scene—two thousand men slaughtered, and only twenty killed by them—oh monstrous!—there was notable Protestant *toleration*, and Protestant humanity!

And “When Cromwell took New Ross by capitulation, General Taaffe demanded liberty of conscience for such as should stay in the town, but Cromwell replied “that if by liberty of conscience was meant A LIBERTY TO EXERCISE THE MASS, he would use plain dealing, and let him know that WHERE THE PARLIAMENT OF ENGLAND HAD POWER, that should not be ALLOWED.”—[Borlace, p. 285.]

But lest the *Protestant ascendancy* of the republicans may not be accounted orthodox by the *modern tyranny*, I will now step over a detail of earlier times from Borlace, and Ludlow, (with which I will finally conclude these letters,) to select a *few* evidences of the lenity, and christian charity of *the Protestants*, after the utter destruction of James and his Irishmen, *as practised by the GOVERNMENT OF WILLIAM*: a government so much in fashion, in Parliament, at this day,—a government always referred to as the æra of the Irish constitution, MISTAKING THE SETTLEMENT OF THE COUNTRY FOR ITS CONSTITUTION; and as the fountain, and palladium of the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY.

I hate Protestant ascendancy; I love Protestant security: I should hate Catholic ascendancy; I hope soon to behold *Catholic equality*—and having promised that this shall be my concluding letter, I shall only  
throw

throw together a few quotations in illustration of the *meekness of that Protestant ascendancy*, but restricted from all further comment.

“ Duke Schomberg, invested Carrickfergus ; he summoned the garrison in vain ; he opened four batteries, and attacked it with the guns of the fleet : a thousand bombs were thrown into the town, and the garrison having expended their powder to the last barrel, marched out with honours of war.—*But the soldiers broke the capitulation ; they disarmed, and stripped the inhabitants, without regard to sex, or quality ; even women stark naked, were whipped publicly between the lines.* [Macpherson’s Hist. G. Britain, vol. 1. p. 570.]

“ The journal of the most remarkable transactions in this war, says Dr. Curry, published at that juncture of time, thus relates this breach of articles at Carrickfergus—The Irish in that town when reduced to one barrel of powder, made soldier-like-terms, and were to be attended by a convoy till they should reach within three miles of Newry : But the articles signed by Schomberg himself were *barbarously violated by the soldiers*, who without regard to age, or sex, or quality, disarmed and stripped the inhabitants of the town, forcing even women to run the gauntlet stark naked.” [Curry, vol. 2d. p. 194.]

“ The impatience of William’s English adherents only served to confirm the Irish in their aversion to the new government, and *by a shameless disregard, and almost perpetual violation of his protections granted to the peasantry, they forced this order* to crowd to their old leaders, and to take arms for their security.”—[Leland, vol. 3. p. 574.]

“ The Irish saw their religion ON THE POINT OF BEING UTTERLY EXTINGUISHED ; and their remains of property ready to be seized by strangers : no security in submission : no reliances upon promises, or pardons.”—[Leland, p. 576.]

“ The



“ The Kingdom of Ireland ever since its reduction in 1691, exhibited one continued scene of *oppression, injustice, and public misery*—the government of James with all its disadvantages, his own bigotry, the insolence of the Papists, *were all more tolerable than the administration of William, ever since the surrender of Limerick.*—Coningsby and Porter the Lords Justices rendered themselves odious by a series of fraud, cruelty, and rapacity; *they sold common justice for money—*and to render their proceedings summary, and to clothe their authority with more terror, for the purpose of most expeditiously enriching themselves, they chose to exert their power *in the military way.*—The corruption at the source of government, extended itself to every lower channel—*The subordinate magistrates, the justices of peace, as if all law was at an end, made their arbitrary pleasure, the rule of their conduct—presuming on their power they deprived persons of their effects, and dispossessed many of their lands, and the road to their justice, lay through their avarice.*” — [Macpherson, vol. 2d. p. 26.]—What a picture of all the miseries of tyranny and INTOLERANCE?—can the despotism of the Seraglio, be more deplorable at this day?

The worthy Leslie having shewn that the *venomous charges* of breach of faith made by Archbishop King, against King James's officers, *were groundless in every instance*, ingenuously confesses, that King William's army after being entire masters of Athlone, *killed in cold blood one hundred men* in the castle, and the little outwork on the river; that at Aughrim above two thousand who had thrown down their arms, and asked quarter, and several who had quarter given them, *were killed in cold blood*; in which number were Lord Galway, and Colonel Moore—That the Major of Colonel Erpingham's dragoons, acknowledged that Lord Galway was killed after quarter, and when the battle was over That MANY HUNDREDS OF THE POOR  
IRISH

IRISH PRISONERS were sent at a time INTO LAMBAY, a waste deserted Island in the sea near Dublin, where their allowance for four days, might, without excess, be eaten at a meal; and being thus out of the reach of their friends, as all persons *were prohibited* to pass into it, with boat or other vessel, *under penalty of forfeiture*, THEY DIED MISERABLY, AND IN HEAPS.” —[Leslie’s Reply to King, and Harris’s Life of King William, p. 318.]

Poor Leslie finally concludes by a fervent prayer, “That God might give DOCTOR KING, before he died, grace to repent sincerely, and confess honestly, all the errors and wilful or malicious representations in this book of his.” —[Leslie, p. 173.] and Dr. Curry observes, that “one cannot help smiling to find an assertion in Doctor King’s Life, lately prefixed to Dean Swift’s Letters to his Grace, that notwithstanding the Archbishop’s silent acquiescences under all the cutting reproaches and assertions of Doctor Leslie for thirty years, “his Grace had by him at his death attested vouchers of every particular fact alleged in his book, which are now *in the hands of his relations*. —[Swift’s Works, vol. 8.]—If this be not a ridiculous boast, continues the spirited and candid Dr. Curry, these relations of his Grace, *are now again thus publickly called upon* to produce these attested vouchers.” —[Curry’s Ireland, vol. 2d. p. 201.]—It is now twenty years since Dr. Curry published this challenge, in his first edition; to which no reply has been hitherto given: THE CONTROVERSY THEREFORE, RESPECTING DOCTOR KING’S CLAIM TO ANY SHARE OF CREDIBILITY, will be judged by the candid readers to be NEARLY DECIDED.

What defence will be set up by THE PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY for the *violation of the Articles of Limerick*?—What apology for the *Education Bill*?—What plea of necessity for the intolerant acts, to *prevent the Growth of Popery*?—Effectually to picture  
PARLIAMENTARY



PARLIAMENTARY PERFIDY, and BROKEN FAITH WITH A PEACEFUL AND AN INCORPORATED PEOPLE, in itself would afford materials for a volume: and the following short clauses in the statutes which I enumerate, will but imperfectly illustrate the extent of the enormity; or the horrors of the Penal Code—THAT CODE, *as at present existing*, is now in circulation, ably compiled by the Hon. Mr. Butler.—To that pamphlet, therefore I refer my candid readers, for a review of the TOLERANCE, and MERCY, the SAGACITY, and the POLICY of the *Protestant Ascendancy* under William, Anne, and George the first.—As the old Jacobite Song used to have it.

“ Sure the Devil ne’er had

Children so bad

As William, and Mary; George, and Anne!”

We may now parody it to

“ Sure Ireland ne’er had

Sovereigns so bad

As William, and Mary; George, and Anne!”

And I shall conclude the reign of George the second by the memorable exemplification of the *morality* and the *humanity* of IRISH PROTESTANTISM, in the bill transmitted to Great Britain for the castration of the Catholic clergy!

THE HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK EVER LOVED, PROFESSED, AND PRACTISED TOLERATION! But their reign over Ireland was not THEIR dominion, it was the tyranny of a PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY: Their two deceased Majesties, the first and the second, would have been beloved and revered, even in the recesses of the most private situation, for the honor and the integrity of their lives: and the accession of George the third seems to have dawned and brightened into day, only to establish the liberty, to restore the commerce, and to protect THE RELIGIONS of this now prosperous, and I trust GRATEFUL island—For our WISDOM as a nation will be best

exhibited in our steady adherence to HIM, and our reverence for the old constitution.

---

P A R T IX.

I HAVE illustrated that the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY neither practised, nor indeed professed TOLERATION: they would not take the useless trouble to wear so tiresome a MASK.

At the head of their armies they drove humanity from their bosoms, they violated their faith, and slaughtered those whom they had disarmed: and in those PERSECUTING ASSEMBLIES which they called representations of all the people, they combined against the more immediate portion of the DEITY in the frame of man, and attempted TO EXTINGUISH THE HUMAN MIND — For the accomplishment of which blasphemous purpose they enacted the STATUTES OF EDUCATION!!!

The authorized establishments for learning in this Kingdom *are exclusively appropriated* to those only, who conform to the established church.

By the 7th of William 3d. it is enacted, and is Law at this day, that no person of the Popish Religion shall TEACH SCHOOL, OR INSTRUCT YOUTH IN LEARNING, under the penalty of twenty pounds, and three months imprisonment. — By the 8th of Queen Anne, if any person shall discover any Popish Schoolmaster, or any Papist teaching, or instructing youth IN PRIVATE HOUSES, such person shall receive as a reward for the same, ten pounds; which shall be levied on the Popish inhabitants of the County — and by the same statute, two Justices may summon *any Papist of sixteen years of age*, and examine him, or her, touching the residence of any Popish *Schoolmaster, Tutor, Usber*, or ASSISTANT TO ANY PROTESTANT



TESTANT SCHOOLMASTER ; and if such person so summoned refuse to appear, he, or she *shall be imprisoned for one year*, or pay a fine of twenty pounds to the poor of the Parish."

Thus the Catholics are precluded from acquiring learning, or any instruction, political, or religious, AT HOME : and thus THE PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY retain upon their statute books these impious and impolitic prohibitions ; and yet are DAILY REPROACHING the Southern peasantry with ignorance and barbarism : an ignorance created, and a barbarism perpetuated by that very ASCENDANCY.

By the seventh of William it is also enacted, and IS NOW LAW, that in case any person shall, him or herself GO TO ANY POPISH SCHOOL in parts beyond the Seas, in order to be educated in the Popish Religion, OR SHALL SEND ANOTHER for the purpose of education ; or shall SEND MONEY, or GOODS towards the maintenance of such person — every person on conviction of so going, or sending, *shall be disabled to sue in Law, to be a Guardian, or Executor, or to take a Legacy, or deed of Gift, or to bear any Office ;* and shall FORFEIT GOODS AND CHATTELS FOR EVER : and LANDS FOR LIFE. And the mode of discovery and prosecution prescribed by this statute is a flagrant deviation from the spirit of the Laws and the Constitution ; but for brevity, I must refer to Mr. Butler's excellent compilation.

And thus the Catholics are precluded by the statutes of the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY from every possible acquisition in science, and learning, ABROAD.

After so vigorous an endeavour TO EXTINGUISH THEIR MINDS ; it will not appear inconsistent for the same ASCENDANCY to have deprived them of SELF DEFENCE ; and consequently the Catholics were UNIVERSALLY DISARMED.—The reason no doubt, was, that as BY SYSTEM they were to be reduced to the standard of brutes, it would become both useless and dangerous

dangerous to accommodate them with weapons.—A man whose mind is totally uncultivated, will too probably become the slave of every gross passion, and degenerate to the depravity of the vilest beasts: and, therefore, every ENLIGHTENED PROTESTANT like my Belfast correspondent, viewing a CATHOLIC in the Volunteer army accoutred for the ranks, must have considered him as A HOG IN ARMOUR.—Indeed, A WELL INFORMED CATHOLIC is at this day, *bona fide*, a scandalous, and an atrocious violator of the Laws of the Land: for where did he procure his education?—At home?—The statutes of the Country are directly in his teeth. — Was he instructed abroad?—Worse, and worse!—“His Chattels ought to be forfeited for Ever; and his Lands for Life!” —And every CONSISTENT PROTESTANT who pretends to respect the Laws of his Country, ought to feel a powerful indignation *at the late admission* of Catholics to the bar, because they must necessarily come to that learned profession IGNORANT, and DEFICIENT; OR AS GROSS VIOLATORS of those statutes of the Realm, which it is their business, and their duty to be acquainted with, and to obey.

But there is no end to the absurdities of this *wicked assemblage*; nor check to ones laughter, but in the contemplation of its BARBARITIES!!—For shame! for shame!—Protestant ascendancy!—Never remain paddling at the shallow edge, when you have a smooth and clear ocean, on which you may launch out at once to Liberty and Philosophy; AND BY ONE SWEEPING VOTE, REPEAL THE PENAL CODE.

By the seventh of William the Third “all Papists shall discover and deliver up to a Justice of peace, their arms, armour, and amunition:—Any two Justices are empowered to search for, and to seize arms in suspected houses; and ALL PAPISTS, including Lords Fingal, Gormanston, and Kenmare, the Cavanaghs,



Cavanaghs, and O'Connors, Edward Byrne, old Mr. Bernard O'Neill, Lord Petre, and Doctor Berrington, if in Ireland, Mr. Magennis of Warringsford, whose ancestors bore rule in Iveagh before the framers of these Laws had arms in their escutcheon, but whose fowling pieces were only as yesterday torn from his apartment in the true venom of Protestant Burglary; Mr. Teeling of Lisburn, and Mr. Mooney, of Belfast, refusing to discover on oath, and to deliver such arms as they have, or without cause neglecting to appear on summons before a magistrate concerning the same, SHALL BE PUNISHED by fine, and imprisonment, and such CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF FILLORY AND WHIPPING as the court of Quarter Session shall in their DISCRETION think proper."

And this is law at this day; and this is the DECENT, MORAL, TEMPERATE use of power made by the mild, forbearing, long suffering, TOLERATING PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY.

But let short sighted men censure as they please the premeditated castration of the Catholic priesthood, by the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY of 1723, according to the second volume of Curry, page 253. I consider the cushioning of that bill in England as *inconsistent, and wrong*; for the Protestant ascendancy at home argued logically and with judgment, that a whole people POLITICALLY DISFRANCHISED, ought to be instructed by a priesthood PHYSICALLY DISFRANCHISED.

There was a species of cruel oppression, tyrannies, and murder exercised by the PROTESTANTS under Cromwell and William, which was little attended to THEN, because the sufferers were, THE POOR; and is totally forgotten NOW, BY SUCH ARRAIGNERS OF CATHOLIC CRUELTY AS MY BELFAST CORRESPONDENT. I mean the uniform slaughter of the NATIVE IRISH wherever they were found, under the denomination

mination of RAPPAREES.—Leslie is filled with recitations of these almost countless murders, inflicted upon UNARMED AND HOUSELESS POVERTY! Wherever they were seen, they were shot, or hanged, or drowned.—These common Irish people were the victims of a species of martial law, more rigorous in its execution, and infinitely more extensive in its destruction, than the slaughter of the Scotch peasantry, by that MONSTER Lauderdale, one of the cabal of Charles the Second.

In one paragraph of the good hearted Leslie, whose natural humanity throughout his book, is always at war with his ecclesiastical zeal.—He thus describes the situation of these miserable Catholics—and he states the circumstances as WELL-KNOWN facts; in direct contradiction, *as usual*, to a solemn asseveration of DOCTOR KING:—“That those who were then called Rapparees, and executed as such, were for the most part, poor harmless country people: *that they were daily killed in vast numbers up and down the fields: or taken out of their beds and shot immediately; which many of the Protestants did loudly attest, and many of the country gentlemen; as likewise several officers of King William’s army, who had more justice and bowels, that the rest did abhor to see what small evidence, or even presumption was thought sufficient to condemn men for Rapparees; and what sport they made to hang up poor Irish people by dozens, almost without pains to examine them—THEY HARDLY THOUGHT THEM HUMAN KIND.*”—[Leslie’s answer to King.] And in Dean Story’s list of persons who were destroyed in this war, there are stated, “of Rapparees killed by the army, or militia, *one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight—of Rapparees killed or hanged up by the soldiers, without any ceremony, one hundred and twenty-two.*” Now this relation is given by a *profest* apologist for the committal of these outrages; and, therefore



therefore he would, undoubtedly reduce the numbers as much as possible: but Doctor Story was a much honest man, and of far superior regard to his word, than Doctor King.—The whole passage of the Dean is too curious and extraordinary to be omitted.

To testify the *liberality* of these reverend memoir writers, upon whose authenticity the *assertions* and *invectives* of my Belfast correspondent are *founded*, I will present my reader with this *sapient* recital of Dean Story, regarding the Irish peasantry.

“ The genius of nations often depends upon the food with which they are nourished. — The potatoe root upon which most of the common Irish subsisted while it encreased their population, diminished their character; because a man by the work of a few days could raise as much food as was sufficient to maintain him the rest of the year. — The Irish Rapparee was the lowest of the people—he lived in the country upon that root alone—he was half naked—his house consisted of a mud wall and a few branches of trees, covered with rushes, a fabric which could be erected in a few hours. — EACH PARTY hunted out these people against the other, for the Rapparees RECEIVING NO MERCY, gave none.—They rendezvoused by paths, which none else knew; and in darkness, and amid deserts they planned their expeditions.”——  
[Story, vol. 1, p. 16.]

The Dean then relates the number of *these victims of cruel laws, and barbarous policy*, as slaughtered by King William's army, and the Protestant militia—  
“ Rapparees killed by the army and militia, 1928 — Rapparees hanged by the soldiers without any ceremony, 112.” [Story, vol. 2, p. 317] Merciful God! two thousand and forty Popish cotters slaughtered by a REGULAR PROTESTANT ARMY, when the war was at an end, because they were very poor, eat potatoes, begot children, and slept under mud  
and

and rushes! Yet here is a writer from Belfast decanting upon CATHOLIC CRUELTY, as if PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY was as unsullied as the silver wings of the dove of the psalmist.

I shall detail no more upon a subject so grievous, than the following quotation from a cotemporary writer, respecting the treatment of these peasantry by Cromwell. Still reminding my impartial reader, that the enormities which it recites were perpetrated by Protestants THIRTY-SIX YEARS PREVIOUS TO THE IMPUTED WANTON CRUELTY of the Catholic Parliament of King James. The author I quote is Colonel Lawrence, who held a distinguished command in Cromwell's army.

“ About the year 1652 and 1653, the plague and famine had so swept away whole countries, that a man might travel thirty miles and not see a living creature, either man, beast, or bird, they being all dead, or had quitted these desolate places. Our soldiers would tell stories of the places where they saw a smoke, it was so rare to see either smoke by day, or fire or candle by night — and when we did meet with two or three cabins, none but very aged men, and women, and children, were found in them; and these were so squalid, that with the prophet they might have complained, ‘ we are become as a bottle in the smoke, our skin is black like an oven, because of the terrible famine.’—I have seen these miserable creatures plucking stinking carrion out of a ditch, black and rotten.—But the most tragical story I ever heard was from an officer commanding a party of horse, who hunting for Irish in a dark night, discovered a light, which they supposed to be a fire that the Irish usually made in these waste countries to dress their provisions, and warm themselves—but drawing near, they found it a ruined cabin, and besetting it round, some did alight, and peep in at the window, where they saw a great fire of wood, and a company of  
of



of miserable old women and children sitting round about it, and betwixt them and the fire, a dead corpse lay broiling, which as the fire roasted they cut off collops, and did eat."—[Colonel Lawrence's Interests of Ireland, 2d part, page 86.]

---

For the RIGHTS of IRISHMEN.

P A R T X.

THE more I have enquired, I become more strongly of opinion that James's imputed bill of attainder DID NOT PASS his memorable Parliament: Yet the moment I am acquainted where it is to be found, or am furnished with *probable documents*, upon better authority than the INVETERATE King, I will respectfully acknowledge my inferiority, as a dabbler in Irish history: But if it DID PASS, I have balanced it with A MORE CRUEL bill of attainder; UNCONSTITUTIONALLY enacted by a British Parliament, from A DATE ANTERIOR to the imputed one of James; SANCTIONED by William; and EXECUTED with rigour.

But the sacred truth of history, is, that neither of the actions were sanctioned by religion, nor dictated by religion: nor ought the guilt of either to stain the ancient, or the modern faith—for religion was THE PRETEXT; domination and territory, THE OBJECT: The native Catholics *might* have made an effort *for their own*; and our Protestant ancestors, *to help themselves to a little more*.

How does the account, therefore, stand between my antagonist and myself—between James and his his Catholics, and William and HIS PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY?

K

Did

Did the Parliament of King James ENACT ANY BILL of forfeiture and attainder, but the bill *for the revival of the court of claims*; which retrospected to Cromwell exclusively; and prescribed COMPENSATION to be made to the dispossessed? — It is problematical, and without proof. — Did King William FORFEIT NEAR A TENTH PORTION OF THE WHOLE ISLAND; AND FOR EVER BANISH, OR DESTROY ITS UNFORTUNATE POSSESSORS? — The fact is as notorious as the statute books, and the revolution.

In whatever scenes the Catholics are impeachable of excesses, they were stimulated by injury, and excited by example. They COULD NOT have given the precedent: They COULD NOT have commenced, they could only repel, or imitate INJUSTICE? for the precedents were established, and THEIR INJURIES had a commencement before the distinction of CATHOLICITY had an existence.

At any period, therefore, of their melancholy history, when they shall be impeached, or shall be convicted of violences against humanity, HISTORY will place before their judges *the provocations which were offered*: and JUSTICE will either ACQUIT THEM, or pardon the delinquency.

For myself, I do not fear Government; but I hope I duly reverence Government — I do not fear it, because in what I have been delivering I have not violated THE CONSTITUTION; for the *exclusive Protestant ascendancy* IS NOT THE CONSTITUTION, MAGNA CHARTA IS THE CONSTITUTION, which extends its privileges TO ALL; the Protestant ascendancy confines LIBERTY TO A FEW: and I entertain a reverence for Government, as an indispensable duty TO THAT CONSTITUTION, to which I am devoted.

At PRESENT I do not know what is the disposition of the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY, so sung in churches, and said in Parliaments; if I was to hazard a guess, I would conclude it was FAR, VERY FAR  
from



from being so ill-natured as it would pretend ; and that like a man of keen sensibility who was doing a KIND THING his emotion was so great, as to constrain him to affect moroseness—But I will illustrate to my Presbyterian countrymen, *by one instance*, what THAT ASCENDANCY WAS, not a great many years since.

A Presbyterian gentleman of the name of Fulton, grandfather, or great grandfather of the numerous and exemplary worthy family of that name, now resident in Lisburn, was married to a Presbyterian young lady, by their own clergyman ; about three score years ago, or a little more — At so sacrilegious a violation of the rights of the clergy, MOTHER CHURCH, in Lisburn, almost fell into an ague.— There happened to be no election contest at that time, and therefore her clergy were not employed in purchasing votes, and delivering lectures on the *harmlessness* of the bribery oath—Instantly, she fulminated the bull of the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY, in the shape of a Magistrate's warrant ; and without loss of time fairly lodged the young couple in the county gaol at Carrickfergus ; there to be as alert, and to keep themselves as warm as they could—so far, very well — This was only innocent ASCENDANCY piety ; for *in those days*, to a man in the society of his wife, a temporary gaol was as indifferent as a palace. But the ASCENDANCY thought they might require some *spiritual* comfort, so next day transmitted the preacher, also, who had united them—A person venerable for his *age*, moral character, and clerical profession, was hurried off in winter upon a common car to a public gaol, seventeen miles distant !!

How many days they remained there, I do not recollect, not having heard the story for some years ; AND BEING REJECTED FOR PARLIAMENTARY BAD CONDUCT from a communication with Lisburn NOW ! —not being likely to hear it any more ; but my  
grandfather

grandfather, Valentine Jones, who yet was as zealous for the ascendancy as the church could desire, went down to Carrackfergus, took bail in the gaol, *which was refused before*; and so returned with his *protestant* neighbour; who had committed the atrocious, **POPISH CRIME**, of marrying a fine woman, by his own teacher, with the immoral determination of begetting children for the defence of the state.

My **RESPECTED** Presbyterian readers! such as you were **THEN**, are the Catholics now. Does not the treatment of Mr. Fulton appear a *detestable tyranny*? — Would you wish to subject any of your countrymen *to the same*? — **WOULD YOU INFLICT UPON ANOTHER**, what you complained of, and *have removed* from yourselves? — **IF YOU WOULD**, it requires not Nathan to pronounce to you “**THAT YOU ARE GUILTY MEN!**”

It has ever been the policy of the British cabinet to sow discord and division in the Irish realm—Sir John Temple, who was in the Government during the troubles of Charles the First, and whose falsehoods and exaggerations are as numerous as his pages, *thus prefaces* his **ROMANCE** of the troubles of forty-one.

“All that I aim at is, that there may remain for the benefit of this present age, and of posterity, **SOME CERTAIN RECORDS** of the first beginning, and progress of this rebellion; that when God’s time is come of returning it into the bosoms of those who have been the plotters or actors therein, and that Ireland comes to be replanted with **BRITISH**, there may be **SUCH A COURSE TAKEN**, **SUCH PROVISIONS MADE**, and **SUCH A WALL OF SEPARATION SET UP BETWIXT THE IRISH AND BRITISH**, as it shall not be in their power to rise up to destroy and root them out, &c.”—[Sir John Temple’s History of the General Rebellion, folio, preface, page 5.]

This



This passage needs no *comment*; and of itself as coming from Sir John Temple, a Lord Justice, a Privy Counsellor, and Master of the Rolls, fully illustrates my *above position*; and, also, as evidently chalks out the *future penal code, as if he had survived to see these accursed, and exterminating statutes enacted*—nothing therefore can be more evident, than that those men *in the present generation* who inhibit the repeal of those sanguinary statutes, mean, *if they mean anything*, “*to take such a course,*” “*to make such provisions,*” and “*to build up such a wall of separation,*” as shall *continue* the disunion of *the native Irish, and the English settlers*, in this long divided, beautiful, yet impotent island.

THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND HAVE EVER LOVED LIBERTY; THEY UNDERSTOOD THE CONSTITUTION; AND ESTIMATED ITS VALUE! With this POSITION I commenced my warfare upon Protestant bigotry in my letter to my constituents of Lisburn in 1782. I continued it in my letter, as commanding officer, to the Volunteers reviewed at Belfast in 1784, in DEFENCE OF MY PRINCIPLES then vehemently attacked, for having proposed, and carried in a meeting of their delegates, an address to my Lord Charlemont, IN THE CATHOLIC'S BEHALF—and with strengthening this POSITION by a few illustrations which have since fallen in my way, I will respectfully conclude THIS LAST TRESPASS which I shall commit upon the public eye.

Respecting the revolt of sixteen hundred and forty-one, so descanted upon with affected horror by the Protestant Lords Deputies, let us review what is related by my Lord Borlace himself as the VERY WORDS of Mr. Conolly, deposed at his examination, on the 22d of October, *in presence of all the government*, assembled at Chichester House. [Borlace's Irish Rebellion, folio, page 27.]

“ Who

“ Who being duly sworn, saith, that he the said Conolly received a letter from Colonel Hugh Mac Mahon to follow him to Dublin, where he repaired with the said Mac Mahon to the lodgings of Lord Mac Guire in Oxmantown, but did not find his Lordship there: but the said Mac Mahon told him that there were many noblemen and gentlemen then in Dublin who were determined to take the Castle, and the ammunition—that they intended to batter the *chimneys* of the city *first*; and if the Protestants did not *join* them, to cut them off.” [Here it appears that the revolting Catholics had a *tenderness* for the Protestants, resolving to batter their *chimneys only*, at first: and also it appears they were willing, and anxious to be *joined* by the Protestants—this does not look like religious hatred, and abhorrence.] —“ THAT THEY DID OWE THEIR ALLEGIANCE TO THE KING, AND WOULD PAY HIM ALL HIS RIGHTS; but that THEY DID THIS THING because of the TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT which was over them; and to imitate Scotland who had gotten a privilege by that course.”

Signed October, 1641,  
OWEN O'CONOLLY.

Lord Justices { W. PARSONS,  
J. TEMPLE,  
R. MEREDITH.

Now there could be no hypocrisy in this speech of poor Mac Mahon, for it was uttered confidentially to Mr. Conolly; who immediately went to court, and betrayed him—and it is an illustration equal to a volume of evidence, *of the oppression of the Protestant government over their Catholic subjects*; and of the even LOYAL resistance to it of these poor oppressed noblemen and their fellows.

It has been the uniform accusation of Doctor King and his partizans, “ that the Catholics FROM THEIR RELIGION are incapable of liberty: the very essence of



of the influence of *that religion* being AN ABSOLUTE SUBMISSION, TEMPORAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL"—and this position already I have in a great degree REFUTED, illustrating it by the example of *the Parliament of James the second*.

At an earlier period, and STILL DARKER TIME, can the conduct of THESE CHILDREN OF SORROW, of these MEXICANS, without the Indian stains, afford additional refutation of the CALUMNIES OF DOCTOR KING?—I disdain to extract my evidences from *friendly pens*, I SEARCH FOR THEIR JUSTIFICATION FROM AMONG THEIR BITTEREST FOES!—And if Lord Borlace, when in the government, had one Puritan prejudice more powerful than the rest, it was his UNGOVERNABLE DETESTATION OF THE CATHOLIC NAME.

After stating the deposition of Mr. Conolly, as already recited, my lord Borlace next relates the "AVOWED COURSE" the Irish Catholic revolvers were determined to take "in reference to their government of the state."—[Borlace, page 40.]

"First they agreed that loyalty to his Majesty should still be preserved: but both his *revenues* and *government* MUST BE REDUCED TO CERTAIN BOUNDS.

"Secondly, for the government, it must be committed into the hands of two Lords Justices, one of the IRISH, and one of ENGLISH race, both of the Romish Profession.

"Thirdly, that a PARLIAMENT be immediately called wherein their own religious men shall also be assistants.

"Fourthly, THAT POYNING'S ACT MUST BE REPEATED, AND IRELAND DECLARED TO BE A KINGDOM INDEPENDENT ON ENGLAND; and without any *reference* to it in any judicial case whatsoever.

"Fifthly, that all acts prejudicial to the Romish religion shall be abolished; and that religion be established.

"Sixthly,

“ Sixthly, that all the ancient nobility of the kingdom shall stand.

“ Seventhly, that all plantation lands shall be recalled, and the ancient proprietors invested in their former estates; *with this limitation in their covenants expressed, “ that they had not sold their interells on valuable considerations.”*

“ Eighthly, that the respective counties of the kingdom be subdivided, and certain boundaries assigned to the chief men, of the nobility, who are to be answerable for the government thereof; and that these governors be of absolute power, *responsible only to the Parliament.*

“ Lastly, that for maintaining a correspondence with other nations, and for securing the coasts, that Ireland may be rendered considerable abroad, *a navy of a certain number of ships is to be maintained: that to this end an annual pension of certain thousands of pounds shall be made up, out of part of the lands appropriated Abbeys: that the business be assigned to a certain order of knights, who are to be seamen.—That to answer this business, all selling of woods serviceable for this use be forbidden.*—[Borlace, p. 31.]

I admit there was a bigotry in establishing the Catholic religion; but had not *we Protestants, through the whole reigns of Elizabeth and James exactly been guilty of the same offence? and was not the Catholic religion at this very instant PROHIBITED in Ireland?*

Behold, then, my countrymen! these Catholics of 1641 asserting their loyalty to their Sovereign Charles 1st, yet *reducing his revenues and government to certain bounds*—appointing two Lords Justices, natives of the realm, one an Irishman, and one of English race—Calling a free Parliament forthwith—Repealing the law of Poynings: declaring the independence of the Irish legislature—abolishing the laws which persecuted their religion—appointing  
governors



governors over certain subdivisions of the kingdom, whose power was to be responsible to Parliament alone—maintaining a correspondence with other nations, and building a navy, *that Ireland may be respectable to other countries* — *Prohibiting the cutting down timber and wasting the woods of the country*—and last of all, determining that the navy shall be maintained from *an appropriation of Abbey lands*.

Behold here, my countrymen, *Catholics*, during the darkness of 1641, appropriating *Catholic church lands* for the maintenance of a navy.

Such were Doctor King's *slavish* deeds of the *ancients of the island*; the children of the *Irish Catholic church*! and such, the *submission of that church to arbitrary power, one hundred and fifty years ago*!

*These documents of their glory are deduced from their bitterest foe*! How then would "their heroic deeds and hapless fate," appear, if delineated by some friendly *cotemporary hand*, escaped from the toils and ravages of war? — But no such friendly hand *escaped*! the sanguinary statute, and the warrant of death, swept away what *war and rapine* had overlooked!

Their adored names ought to preach patriotism to future ages; and enthrone the *majesty of public virtue* in the hearts of Irishmen, when *profligate wit, and parts, and eloquence*, shall not have a leaf of all their *withered bays* to recommend them.

In consequence of Mr. Conolly's beforementioned SINGLE deposition, Borlace and the Lords Justices, FOUR DAYS AFTER issued commissions to Lord Claneboys and Ardes, to Sir William, to Sir Robert Stewart, and others in the North, "giving them power to prosecute the Northern rebels WITH FIRE AND SWORD: yet so as to rescue such as should submit to his Majesty's grace: signifying withal, THAT FOR THOSE WHO WERE CHIEF AMONG THE REBELS, they required them NOT TO BE TOO FORWARD IN PROFERING THEM MERCY, WITHOUT FIRST CONSULT-

ing the COUNCIL BOARD." [Borlace, p. 42.]—The meaning of which *prohibition of mercy to the leaders* was, that the Lords Justices *wanted their lands, and rejoiced in their rebellion*—A REBELLION TO WHICH THEY AND THEIR PREDECESSORS, FROM THE TENTH OF ELIZABETH, [which marked the fatal recal of the amiable Sir John Perrott] HAD COMPELLED THEM, BY EVERY TEMPORAL, AND EVERY SPIRITUAL OPPRESSION.

Now upon the head of TOLERATION, and the *reasonable mode* of allaying this ferment in Ireland, What did the PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY in the British Parliament ENACT, on the 8th of December, 1641, following?—They had the stupidity, and the impudence to come to THIS RESOLUTION, "That THEY never would give consent TO ANY TOLERATION of the Popish religion, IN IRELAND; or in any other of his Majesty's dominions."—[Borlace, p. 52.]

Thus, at once, in one single tyrannical resolution, VIOLATING THE CONSTITUTION OF IRELAND; and also every principle of *toleration, of conscience*, and of CHRISTIANITY!—It was a pity that crazy Sir Phelim O'Neill and ten thousand Irish, had not dropped down about their ears, and made a scatterment more speedy than they afterwards experienced from their SERVANT Oliver.

These ILLUSTRIOUS DEAD, of whom I have ventured to descant, were simple and courageous; yet they do not appear unlettered; and certainly were not sanguinary. Their melancholy tale is involved in obscurity, and BLACKENED BY DETRACTION; and the eye of the historian melts over their violated FAME.

" So stream the sorrows which EMBALM THE BRAVE;

" The tear which SCIENCE sheds o'er GLORY'S GRAVE!"

My



My Lord Borlace communicates the *following* extraordinary transaction, with a good degree of RELIGIOUS RANCOUR, and ENGLISH INDIGNATION!—Its illustration of my position is conclusive, and shall be final, “ THAT THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND HAVE EVER UNDERSTOOD AND LOVED THE CONSTITUTION.”

“ We render you an account given in upon oath in March, 1641, before Sir Robert Meredyth, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the examination of Edward Dowdall, Esq; a person of great esteem among the Irish. He deposeth that there issued a warrant from the Lord of Gormanston, to the Sheriff of the county for a general meeting of all the county at Duleek; but the place of meeting was afterwards changed to the hill of Crofty, where all the lords and gentlemen of the pale, resident in that county, resorted—they had been assembled, to the number of about a thousand horsemen for near three hours, when there rode, towards them Roger Moore, Hugh Mac Mahon, Philip and Hugh O'Reily, Hugh Byrne, and Captain Fox; the lords and gentry of the pale then rode towards them, and the Lord Gormanston advancing, demanded why they came armed into the pale, and what was their reason of discontent? When ROGER MOORE made present answer.

“ That the ground of their coming thither and taking up arms, was FOR FREEDOM, and, THE LIBERTY OF THEIR CONSCIENCES: the maintenance of his Majesty's government, WHICH THEY UNDERSTOOD HE WAS ABRIDGED OF: AND THE MAKING THE SUBJECTS OF THIS KINGDOM AS FREE AS THOSE IN ENGLAND WERE.” Whereupon Lord Gormanston desired to understand from them truly and faithfully, whether these were pretences, or the true grounds of their revolt? Which being sworn in the affirmative, the Lord Gormanston, in the name of all present, said, “ seeing these be your true ends,  
*then*

*then we will likewise join with you therein."* And this whole body of Catholics then adjourned to the *hill of Tarab*, in the county of Meath." [Borlace, p. 58.] In a few days after, they drew up a manifesto and dispatched it to England by the Lord Dillon of Castlegallon, the purport and articles of which were these.

"A general, and free pardon to ALL his Majesty's subjects of Ireland, to be ratified by a statute of the Irish Parliament.

"That all marks of *national distinction between English and Irish* shall be abolished by a statute of the Irish Parliament.

"That by *acts of Parliament to be respectively passed here, and in England it may be declared*, that the Parliament of Ireland hath no subordination to the Parliament of England; but that the same possesses in itself *a supreme jurisdiction in this kingdom, as absolute as the Parliament of England there hath*.

"That Poyning's law, and all acts expounding, or explaining the same, *be repealed*.

"That as in England there passed an act for triennial Parliaments, so in Ireland there may pass another for a sexennial Parliament, that is, for six years duration.

"That there shall be a *toleration* of the Catholic religion."—[Sir John Temple, p. 72.]

Sir John Temple's concluding observation upon these transactions is very entertaining, and it seems to have provoked him no little—"That these Irish Catholics did speak with much scorn and contempt of such Englishmen as brought little with them into Ireland; but being here planted, in a little time contracted great fortunes."—[Temple, p. 72.] Now, God wot, that was but natural enough.

I have been necessarily diffusive in my reply to this anonymous writer from Belfast, *whose arrogant mode of expression*, under the wretched subterfuge of  
The



its being a *female* composition, compelled this detail. But such *random shots* impede not my country's course.

The Catholic cause in peaceful progression, from its magnitude, mocks opposition; and far elevated above common conflicts, the circumscribed, and vulgar party politics of the day, gradually rising into the view of empire, bids calm defiance to prejudice and monopoly; and exalted above passion, resentment, and partiality, amid the *petty discords of present opinion*, ascending sheds propitious promise of national happiness; a *universal* diffusion of benefits upon ALL.

“ Calmy resplendent as the full orb'd moon,  
 “ When rising from the watry waste, she sheds  
 “ Her lustrous pearls upon the TOSSING WAVES.”

F I N I S.





